



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

OCT 14
THEOLOGICAL SE

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X.

OCTOBER, 1912.

NUMBER 4.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

At the close of the second century, the virgin birth was a firmly established part of the creed of the Catholic Christian Church. What was the origin of that belief? This question can be answered only after an examination of the birth narratives which are included in our first and third Gospels. But an examination of extra-canonical sources is also not without value. At the time of Irenaeus, belief in the virgin birth was firmly established. Can a gradual establishment of that belief be traced in the history of the second century, or was the belief firmly fixed from the very beginning? The present article will attempt to give some answer to this question, and thus lay the necessary foundation for answering the further and more important question: is the belief in the virgin birth based upon fact, or did it originate in some other way?

Of course, no one denies that the belief in the virgin birth arose long before Irenaeus. The most that could by any possibility be held is that the doctrine did not attain the full assent of the Church until his time. Even such a view, however, can be dismissed very quickly.

In the first place, the virgin birth has a place in the so-called Apostles' Creed.¹ The form of that creed which is now in use was produced in Gaul in the fifth or sixth cen-

¹ The following discussion of the Apostles' Creed is not based upon independent investigation. All that has been attempted is to point out the bearing which the commonly accepted conclusions in this field have upon the question of the virgin birth. See especially Harnack, *Vetus-*

tury, but this Gallican form is based upon an old Roman baptismal confession, from which it differs for the most part only in minor details. The virgin birth appears as clearly in the older form of the creed as in the later Gallican form.² The Roman confession, which was written originally in Greek, must be dated at least as early as 200 A. D., because it is the ancestor not only of our Gallican creed but also of the many various creeds used in different parts of the Western Church.³ The use of the creed by Tertullian (North Africa) and Irenaeus (Asia Minor and Gaul), coupled with the absence in the creed of polemic against Gnosticism and Marcion, pushes the date back at least to about 150 A. D.⁴ At about 150 A. D., therefore, the virgin birth was part of the creed of the Roman church; belief in it was solemnly confessed by every convert before baptism.⁵ The importance of this fact should not be underestimated. For, in the first place, it is obvious that no new and strange doctrines can be incorporated in such a creed. Belief in the virgin birth must have been universal in the Roman church

tissimum Ecclesiae Romanae Symbolum e scriptis virorum Christianorum qui primo et altero p. Chr. n. Saeculo vixerunt illustratum, in Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Fasc. i. Part. ii, pp. 115-142, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, 26te Aufl., 1892, Art. "Apostolisches Symbolum", in Herzog, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3te Aufl., 1896, Zahn, *Das apostolische Symbolum*, 2te Aufl., 1893, Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbolum*, 2 Bde., 1894-1900, Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, 1902, McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed*, 1902.

² The older form has simply "born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary" (γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου) instead of "conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary".

³ See Harnack, Article cited in Herzog, *op. cit.*, pp. 745 ff.

⁴ So Harnack. McGiffert differs at this point decisively from the common view. He detects an anti-Marcionitic purpose in the creed, and places the date between 150 and 175; but he is hardly correct in these contentions, though he has pointed out weaknesses in some of the external evidence adduced for an early date.

⁵ Whether the creed at first contained the words ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ after γεννηθέντα or read simply γεννηθέντα ἐκ (διὰ) Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου is an interesting question, but of minor importance for the present discussion. McGiffert, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 f., favors the latter alternative. But cf. Kattenbusch, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 619 f.

and must have been required of every candidate for baptism long before it was given stereotyped expression in a definite baptismal confession. In the second place, the central position of the Roman church makes it probable that what was regarded as essential Christian belief at Rome was also the belief of the Church at large. Any considerable dissent from the doctrine of the virgin birth in any part of the Church would probably have prevented its insertion in the Roman confession. Finally, the character of the creed itself doubles the weight of the considerations just adduced. The old Roman creed is evidently not polemic in character.⁶ If it were, it might well contain doctrines which had only recently been firmly established in Rome and were still opposed in other parts of the Church. Such a polemic purpose could hardly fail to appear clearly, if it were really influential in the formation of the creed. An anti-docetic purpose, for example, would naturally appear in the insertion of a "truly"⁷ in connection with the summary of the earthly life of Jesus. As a matter of fact, the creed evidently contains what needed to be emphasized not against heretics but against the non-Christian world. Furthermore, it is a model of brevity. The only facts about Jesus which find a place in this earliest creed of the Church are the virgin birth, the death, the resurrection, the ascension, the session at the right hand of God, and the future judgment. Evidently such an enumeration was intended as the absolute minimum of Christian belief. The virgin birth might well have been accepted by a large portion of the Church without finding a place in such a creed. Its presence there shows that it was regarded as one of the essentials like the death and resurrection.

The middle of the second century is not the earliest but almost the latest date which has been suggested by recent

⁶ Harnack, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 18: "Es ist aus der missionirenden und katechetischen Funktion der Kirche hervorgegangen und war ursprünglich lediglich Taufsymbol." The protest of McGiffert against this view has been noted above, footnote 4.

⁷ After the manner of Ignatius, *Smyrn.* i.

scholars for the origin of the old Roman creed. Striking parallels with the creed can be detected clearly in writers whose activity lies wholly or partly in the former half of the second century—especially in Justin Martyr and in Ignatius. If such parallels are to be interpreted as indicating dependence upon the Roman creed, then the creed must have been produced as early as 100 A. D.⁸ Moreover, the simplicity of form and especially the brevity of the creed speak strongly for a high antiquity. The creed is commended by what it omits as much as by what it contains. Could a compiler of 150 A. D. have resisted the temptation of guarding the faith against heresy?⁹

Of course, no attempt can here be made to settle this question of date. But if the creed was produced so late as 150 A. D. in Rome, it is by no means the only or the earliest second-century witness to the virgin birth.¹⁰

Clement of Alexandria should first be mentioned, for although his witness is no older than that of Irenaeus it comes from a very different part of the Church. He could not be included among the witnesses to the Roman symbol, for his use of that symbol cannot be demonstrated, but his belief in the virgin birth is undoubted. Indeed, he shows that the simple story of the virgin birth had already had time to be elaborated considerably beyond its original form.¹¹

⁸ The positive arguments which Harnack, *Antwort auf die Streitschrift D. Cremers: "Zum Kampf um das Apostolikum"*, 1892, in *Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt"*, Nr. 3, adduces against a date earlier than 140 A. D. are probably no more decisive than the positive arguments in favor of the early date.

⁹ Such internal evidence weighs very strongly with Kattenbusch, who fixes the date at ± 100 A. D. (*op. cit.*, ii. p. 328). Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 47, supposes that the baptismal confession attained essentially the form which it has in the old Roman symbol at some time between 70 and 120.

¹⁰ For the second-century testimonies to the virgin birth, see especially Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 41ff., also Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 42ff. Cf. Hoben, *The Virgin Birth*, in *American Journal of Theology*, vi., 1902, pp. 481 ff.

¹¹ Strom., vii. 16, 93. Cf. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, 1909, p. 68, Anm. 2.

Justin Martyr regards the virgin birth as of fundamental importance and defends it at length against Jewish and heathen objections. If he knew the Apostles' Creed, his insistence upon the virgin birth requires no comment. But even if he did not know the creed in its Trinitarian form, he bears testimony to the existence of a Christological summary in which the virgin birth had a place.¹² The virgin birth comes naturally into his mind when he thinks of the fundamental facts of the life of Christ. In one passage, the virgin birth appears pretty clearly as part of a regular formula of exorcism.¹³ As indicating the common belief of the Church, a formula of exorcism is perhaps only less valuable than a baptismal confession. The details which it contains are mentioned not because of any particular relevancy under the circumstances, but merely as essential elements of the Christian conception of Christ. They are necessary to define His "name".¹⁴

Aristides, whose apology¹⁵ may perhaps be dated about

¹² See passages in Harnack, in the dissertation cited from Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, pp. 128ff.

¹³ *Dial.* 85: Κατὰ γὰρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως, καὶ διὰ παρθένου γεννηθέντος καὶ παθητοῦ γενομένου ἀνθρώπου, καὶ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἀποθανόντος, καὶ ἀναστάντος ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἀναβάντος εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, πᾶν δαιμόνιον ἐξορκιζόμενον νικᾷται καὶ ὑποτάσσεται. Cf. Otto's note, who cites Origen, *contr. Cels.* i. 6: οὐ γὰρ κατακληθήσεσιν ἰσχύειν δοκοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν. The passage in Justin is such an ἐπαγγελία τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν.

¹⁴ The argument of Hillmann, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1891, pp. 255 f., that Justin must be regarded as a pioneer in the support of the virgin birth because he regards as Christians those who deny the doctrine depends upon a false reading in *dial.* 48. In reality, Justin does not say that the opponents of the virgin birth are Christians. See below, pp. 548f., and cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, ii., 1905, p. 645.

¹⁵ The *Apology*, except for a fragment, was unknown until 1889, when a Syriac translation was discovered by J. Rendel Harris. Soon after, J. Armitage Robinson discovered that a Greek text had been preserved within the romance of *Barlaam and Josaphat*. For the reconstruction of the *Apology* and comprehensive discussions of Aristides, see especially Harris and Robinson, in *Texts and Studies*, i. 1, 1893,

140 A. D.,¹⁶ regarded the virgin birth as one of the fundamental facts of Christianity.¹⁷ Harris supposes that the virgin birth in all probability formed part of the *symbolum fidei* as Aristides knew it.¹⁸ At any rate, the virgin birth is given a place by Aristides in a very brief Christological summary. It appears clearly as one of the absolutely essential facts,

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who was martyred not later than 117 A. D., mentions the virgin birth clearly in several passages.¹⁹ It is perfectly evident from these passages that Ignatius regarded the virgin birth as one of the essential facts about Christ. It is one of the "mysteries to be shouted aloud", one of the mysteries which were prepared by God in silence but have now been proclaimed to the ages by the wondrous star in the heavens. Or rather, Ignatius does not say merely that the *virgin birth* is one of the three mysteries—in such a form of expression the whole emphasis might conceivably be laid upon the fact of the birth rather than upon the manner of it—he says distinctly that the *virginity of Mary* is one of the mysteries. The important fact is not

Seeberg, in Zahn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, v. Teil, pp. 159ff., Geffcken *Zwei griech. Apologeten*, 1907, pp. 1-96.

¹⁶ So Seeberg. The date cannot be fixed with certainty, but the work bears marks of antiquity.

¹⁷ See Harris and Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 29, 32, 36, 100, and p. 3 of the appended Syriac text, Seeberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 331f. The virgin birth is found in all three recensions—Armenian, Syriac and Greek. Without doubt it had a place in the original text.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 23ff.

¹⁹ *Eph.* xviii.2 - xix. 1: 'Ο γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ'οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου ὃς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη, ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ. Καὶ ἔλαθεν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας καὶ ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ κυρίου· τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, ἅτινα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ θεοῦ ἐπράχθη, *Smyrn.* i. 1, 2: πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου, βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετραρρχοῦ καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί. . . . In *Eph.* vii. 2 καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ and *Eph.* xx. 2 τῷ νύφ' ἀνθρώπου καὶ νύφ' θεοῦ, Ignatius probably has the virgin birth definitely in mind.

merely that Jesus was born, but also that Mary was a virgin. In one passage, the virgin birth forms part of such a summary of the chief facts about Christ as has already been detected in Justin.²⁰ Harnack is therefore justified in saying: "Ignatius has freely reproduced a 'kerugma' of Christ which seems, in essentials, to be of a fairly definite historical character and which contained, *inter alia*, the Virgin Birth, Pontius Pilate and the ἀπέθανεν."²¹

The full importance of the testimony which Ignatius bears to the virgin birth can be appreciated only when the general purpose of his epistles is borne in mind.²² Ignatius is argu-

²⁰ *Smyrn. i.* In this passage, Zahn reads θεου after δυναμιν and γεγενημενον instead of γεγεννημενον, and omitting the comma before γεγενημενον joins it closely with υἱὸν θεοῦ. Lightfoot's text and punctuation, which have here been followed in the citation above, preserve the parallelisms between ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σὰρκα and υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν and between γεγεννημένον and the following participles. These parallels seem certainly to be intended. Ignatius first mentions the twofold nature of Christ ("of the seed of David" and "Son of God"), and then enumerates the leading individual facts in His earthly life, namely birth, baptism and crucifixion (the resurrection does not here appear in the same form, because Ignatius turns aside to mention the blessed results of that true passion which the docetists were unwilling to admit). Zahn's defence of his view of the passage is not convincing.

²¹ Harnack, Article cited from Herzog, *op. cit.*, English Translation (*The Apostles' Creed*), pp. 59f. The reasoning by which Hillmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 253f., eliminates the testimony to the virgin birth from the Ignatian epistles hardly requires refutation. Hillmann argues that since the author traces the Davidic descent of Jesus through Joseph therefore he could not have accepted the virgin birth. But in the first place, it is not certain that Ignatius traces the Davidic descent through Joseph rather than through Mary (see Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 15), and in the second place, even if he does, he may rightly or wrongly have united the virgin birth with that view. Like others in the early Church (for example the authors or compilers or interpolators of Matthew and Luke), he may have supposed the two things to be in harmony. As a matter of fact, Ignatius plainly expresses his belief in the virgin birth. It is another question how he harmonized it with his belief in the Davidic descent. Hillmann supposes that γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου in *Smyrn. i.* is an interpolation; the famous passage, *Eph. xix. 1*, he does not even mention. Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iii., 1905, pp. 645f.

²² For the argument which follows, see Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 f.

ing against docetists; to refute them it was not necessary to prove the virgin birth of Christ, but only to prove His real birth. "Born of a woman" would have been sufficient, indeed it might seem to be a more emphatic contradiction of docetism than "born of a virgin". Yet in *Smyrn.* i. 1, it is the latter phrase which Ignatius uses; the phrase seems to slip naturally from his pen.²³ He does not appear to be under the slightest necessity of defending it; apparently the opponents themselves accepted the virgin birth as over against an ordinary birth, but regarded it, like every other event in the life of Christ, as a mere semblance. Ignatius clearly gives the impression that in his day the virgin birth was far beyond the reach of controversy, both in Antioch and in Asia Minor. Other errors had to be combatted; but not the error that made Jesus by ordinary generation the son of Joseph. The testimony of Ignatius, therefore, is unequivocal. At 110 A. D., belief in the virgin birth was no new thing. It had its roots already deep in the life of the Church. It must have arisen very considerably before the close of the first century.

The other apostolic fathers do not mention the virgin birth, but in view of the clear testimony of Ignatius, their silence is meaningless.²⁴ It is preposterous to expect the doctrine to be mentioned inevitably in every epistle and every moral treatise. How often is it mentioned to-day in the sermons and in the devotional writings even of those who insist most strongly upon it? The early Christian writers were not conscious that posterity would be dependent upon a few brief writings of theirs for its entire knowledge of the second-century Church. They were not concerned, therefore, to give a complete summary of their views about Jesus, but addressed themselves to special needs.²⁵ Ignatius

²³ Of course, at other times he speaks simply of the birth without mentioning the peculiar manner of it. See *Magn.* xi, *Trall.* ix. 1.

²⁴ To call it "a uniform and notable silence" (Hoben, *op. cit.*, p. 481) is misleading. The passages where Hoben supposes the virgin birth would have been mentioned if it had been accepted are not convincing.

²⁵ Hillmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 250ff., argues that in 1 *Clem.* xxxii. 1 Jesus

mentioned the virgin birth only because the reality of Jesus' earthly life had been assailed. Against the docetic errorists, it was necessary to insist upon the birth of Jesus. But insistence upon the birth of Jesus meant insistence upon a virgin birth. Ignatius and his opponents were apparently not aware that any other kind of birth had ever been attributed to Jesus in the Church. The virgin birth of Christ, says Ignatius, is one of the great mysteries. And he insists upon the greatness of the mystery in order that his readers may see how important it is to hold, against the docetists, that the mystery is a real thing and no mere semblance. The more marvelous the birth of Christ, the more important it becomes to vindicate its reality. Justin mentioned the virgin birth because, in the first place, his plan was more comprehensive than that of the apostolic fathers. He was attempting a defence of Christianity as a whole, and therefore could not ignore such an essential element in Christian belief as the virgin birth of the Lord. In the second place, the virgin birth required special defence, because it was the object of special attack. But the attack came from men outside the Church. The virgin birth was attacked by outsiders just because it was known as one of the characteristic Christian beliefs. The silence which early Christian writers preserve about the virgin birth when they are writing against schis-

is represented as belonging to the tribe of Levi, and that therefore, since there is no tradition that Joseph was a Levite, the Levitic descent of Jesus must have been traced through Mary. In that case, he continues, the Davidic descent, which of course could not be given up, must have been traced through Joseph. Therefore Joseph must have been regarded as the father of Jesus, and the author did not believe in the virgin birth. But, as has been noticed above (footnote 21), Davidic descent through Joseph was (to say the least) not always regarded in the early Church as contradicting the virgin birth, and in the second place, it is highly improbable that Clement in the passage cited really meant to imply that Jesus was descended from Levi (see Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 11ff.). As to Hillmann's argument from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*op. cit.*, pp. 25ff.), it is perhaps sufficient again to refer to Bauer, *loc. cit.* "Geistige Abstammung von Levi und Juda hat keineswegs die leibliche von beiden Geschlechtern zur Voraussetzung" (Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 13).

matics and heretics, and Justin's elaborate defence of it against unbelievers, are alike indications of the firm position which it held in the faith of the Church.²⁶

The preceding investigation has shown that a firm and well-formulated belief in the virgin birth extended back at least to the beginning of the second century. How did that belief originate? It may have originated in a fact, or it may have originated in some other way. Toward the answer to this question some progress has already been made. For, the older the belief in the virgin birth, the more likely it is to be based upon fact. Myths and legends require time for development. Something has therefore been gained by the proof that the virgin birth was a firmly established part of Christian belief within a few years after the death of the last surviving eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus.

The question arises, however, whether the testimony to the virgin birth is unanimous, even from the beginning of the second century on. May it not be balanced by counter testimony to an ordinary human birth? Obviously the investigator must institute a careful search for positive denials of the virgin birth in the early period of the Christian Church.

Such denials are not hard to find, and they may be divided into two classes; (1) denials of the virgin birth by opponents of Christianity, and (2) denials by professing Christians.

Under the former head,²⁷ the denials of the virgin birth by *pagan* opponents of Christianity can hardly be expected to be of much historical value. It is hardly likely that after Christianity had claimed the serious attention of the Graeco-Roman world, the opponents would be able or willing to institute scientific investigations in Palestine with regard to the birth of Jesus. Such a method of attack would be contrary to all that is known of the religious controversies of antiquity. It is a little different, however, with regard to

²⁶ Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 46, 47, has rightly called attention to the testimony borne to the virgin birth in the second century even by heretics. Cf. Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 37ff. Those heretics who denied the virgin birth will be discussed below, pp. 541ff.

²⁷ See Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 458ff.

those denials of the virgin birth which proceeded from the *Jews*. From the very beginning, the Jews were in close contact with Jesus and with His followers, and the relation was for the most part one of active opposition. If the real facts of the birth of Jesus were concealed by the Christians, it is altogether conceivable that the Jewish opponents could have handed down the true story. The Jewish view of the birth of Jesus must, therefore, be examined with some care.

The earliest source for investigating the Jewish objections to the virgin birth is Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. But the Jew, Trypho, is not represented as offering any concrete facts in opposition to the Christian story. The inconsistency of the virgin birth with the common Jewish Messianic hopes is emphasized,²⁸ exception is taken to the Septuagint rendering in Is. vii. 14,²⁹ the discrediting similarity of the virgin birth to heathen myths such as that of the birth of Perseus from Danaë³⁰ is noticed, positive evidence against the virgin birth of the Messiah is produced from the Old Testament.³¹ But there is no alternative Jewish story of the actual circumstances of the birth of the man Jesus.³²

Origen's treatise against Celsus supplies what is lacking in Justin. The Jew whose anti-Christian polemic Celsus is repeating does not content himself with ordinary objections to the virgin birth or mere ridicule of it,³³ but seeks to substitute for it an account of the true course of events, which

²⁸ *Dial.* 49 (268A).

²⁹ The objection is to the rendering παρθένος instead of νεάνις. *Dial.* 67 (291A). Cf. *dial.* 43 (262C).

³⁰ *Dial.* 67 (291B).

³¹ *Dial.* 68 (293C,D).

³² It has been suggested that there is an allusion to such a story (which would resemble the one that will presently be examined) in *dial.* 23 (241B). There Justin calls Jesus τὸν κατὰ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ δίχα ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ παρθένου γεννηθέντα υἱὸν θεοῦ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. If δίχα ἁμαρτίας is to be read, there may perhaps be an allusion to a story of a birth of Jesus out of wedlock, but such an interpretation is very uncertain. Cf. Otto's note, and Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 458f., who cites also Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. p. 778.

³³ *Contr. Cels.* i. 39 (ed. Delarue, p. 356).

Jesus Himself is said to have concealed by the miraculous story. Jesus was really the fruit of an adulterous union of Mary with a certain soldier whose name was Pantheras, and on account of her adultery His mother had been cast out of her home by her husband, the carpenter.³⁴ Similar stories appear in the Talmud (but with wide divergences so far as names and circumstances are concerned), and reach their culmination in the mediaeval Tōl'dōth Jēshū. The same slander is also perhaps alluded to by Tertullian.^{34a} The Jewish polemic used by Celsus can hardly be put much later than the middle of the second century, and although the parts of the Talmud where the stories about Jesus occur are late, they certainly are based upon earlier tradition. Furthermore, traces of this kind of Jewish polemic against the virgin birth have been discovered by some scholars in the Protevangelium of James³⁵ and even in the canonical Gospel of Matthew.³⁶ But however early the story of the adultery of Mary may be, it is now universally agreed that far from representing any independent tradition it is based merely upon the Christian story of the virgin birth.³⁷ Hence the early Jewish slander

³⁴ *Contr. Cels.* i. 28 (p. 346), i. 32 (pp. 349, 350).

^{34a} *De spect.* 30, "fabri aut quaestuariae filius", cited by Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 458.

³⁵ A. Meyer, in Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, pp. 99f. There seems to be no necessity for supposing, as Meyer does, that the Protevangelium is directed also against a Jewish Christian belief in the birth of Jesus from Joseph and Mary.

³⁶ For example by Zahn, and by A. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 49. For an exposition and criticism of the view of Zahn, see PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iii., 1905, pp. 65off.

³⁷ The story of the illegitimate birth of Jesus was at least not excluded by Bahrđt, *Briefe über die Bibel im Volkston*, 1782, i. pp. 130ff., and was expanded into an elaborate narrative by Venturini, with detailed rationalizing not only of the canonical narratives but also of the Protevangelium of James (Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazareth*, 2te Aufl., 1806). According to Venturini, the true father of Jesus was connected with the Essenes; and afterwards Jesus Himself became an Essene. Venturini's romance was the source of the anonymous work, *Historische Enthüllungen über die wirklichen Ereignisse der Geburt und Jugend Jesu* (of which the second edition appeared at Braunschweig in 1849), which purported to

is simply one testimony more, and that not an unimportant one, to the general belief of early Christianity in the virgin birth, and to the absence of any positive historical tradition that could contradict it.³⁸

Accordingly, the denials of the virgin birth by opponents of Christianity have absolutely no weight as against the historicity of the event. The opponents presuppose the Christian doctrine, and have no historical tradition of their own to substitute for it. The mere fact of their opposition is of no importance whatever, for it is only what was to be expected. Unless they were to become Christians, they could hardly accept the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.

At first sight, however, it may not seem quite so easy to account for the other class of denials of the virgin birth—denials, namely, on the part of professing Christians. What except true historical tradition could lead any Christian to

be taken from an ancient manuscript! In recent years also, the biologist Haeckel has given credence to the Pandera story (*Welträthsel*, English Translation, pp. 375ff.), but of course has not been followed by any historical student. Cf. the refutations of Haeckel by Loofs, in *Christliche Welt*, 1899, columns 1069f., and Hilgenfeld, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1900, pp. 265f.

³⁸ Cf. Origen, *Contr. Cels.* i. 32 (p. 350): Καὶ ἴδωμεν εἰ μὴ τυφλῶς οἱ μυθοποιήσαντες τὴν μοιχείαν τῆς παρθένου καὶ τοῦ Πανθήρα καὶ τὸν τέκτονα ἐξωσάμενον αὐτὴν ταῦτα πάντα ἀνέπλασαν ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει τῆς παραδόξου ἀπὸ ἀγίου πνεύματος συλλήψεως· ἐδύναντο γὰρ ἄλλως ψευδοποιῆσαι διὰ τὸ σφόδρα παράδοξον τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ μὴ ὥσπερ εἰ ἀκουσίως συγκαταθέσθαι ὅτι οὐκ ἀπὸ συνήθων ἀνθρώποις γάμων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐγεννήθη. It is true, there are some indications that the Jews, when they denied the virgin birth, did not always substitute for it the story which has just been described, but perhaps sometimes represented Jesus as simply the son of Joseph. But of the evidence which Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 458, cites for the latter representation, the only passage that is of early date is Tertullian, *de spect.* 30 (quoted above, p. 34a), where Bauer supposes that the two alternative methods of attack are placed side by side. The allusion there is very indefinite. It is quite possible that Tertullian is simply referring to the unbelief of Jesus' contemporaries (Mt. xiii. 55), as he is in the sentences that immediately follow. At any rate, if the Jews in the second century ever did maintain against the Christians that Jesus was physically the son of Joseph, there is not the slightest indication that they had any traditional basis for their contention independent of the canonical Gospels. Mt. xiii. 55 οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; was obviously the starting-point.

deny the miraculous conception of his Lord, provided he had once become acquainted with it? It becomes evident at once that Christian denials of the virgin birth demand very careful attention.³⁹

When the virgin birth was denied, two possibilities were left open. If Jesus was not born of a virgin, he may either have been begotten by Joseph or else he may never have been born at all. Those who held the latter view⁴⁰ are of little importance for the present investigation, for their denial of the virgin birth evidently proceeded not from historical tradition, but from philosophical theory. To them, any birth, even a birth from a virgin, seemed to bring Christ into too intimate relation to the world.⁴¹ If the virgin birth is mythical, then Marcion's denial is not a refutation of the myth, but a further development of it.⁴²

Carpocrates and Cerinthus regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary. They differ from Marcion, therefore, in that what they substitute for the virgin birth is possible and of itself probable. Hence their denial of the virgin birth, while it may be the product of philosophical speculation, may also prove to be derived from historical tradition. The question cannot be quite so easily decided as in the case of Marcion.

Carpocrates⁴³ was a Gnostic thinker of the first half of the second century. The world he held to have been created by angels far inferior to the supreme Father. Jesus, he sup-

³⁹ The invaluable work of Bauer, which has already been cited a number of times, has been used very freely both for the discussion immediately following and in other parts of the present article. Bauer has collected the materials for investigation with unparalleled fulness.

⁴⁰ For example, Marcion. See Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 34ff.

⁴¹ See the vigorous passage in Tertullian, *de carne Christi* (Oehler ii. pp. 425, 426).

⁴² If, as was formerly supposed by many scholars, Marcion's gospel, which contained no account of the birth of Jesus, represented the original form of the Gospel of Luke, of which our third Gospel is an expansion, then Marcion could not be dismissed so readily. But that hypothesis has now been generally abandoned.

⁴³ See, for example, G. Krüger, Article "Karpokrates", in Herzog, *op. cit.*

posed, differed from other men only in greater strength of soul, which enabled Him to remember what He had seen in the presence of the supreme God. God sent a power upon Him, in order that He might escape from the creators of the world. Every soul which will imitate Jesus may accomplish as much as He. In order to escape further incarnations, men should strive to have experience of all kinds of actions. All morality consists in faith and love, everything else is good or bad only in human opinion, not in reality. It will be seen at once how very slight is the connection of such a system with Christianity. It is not surprising that followers of Carpocrates at Rome placed representations of Jesus by the side of those of Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle very much after the manner of the later pagan emperor.⁴⁴

Obviously, the author of such a system would not require any historical evidence to induce him to deny the virgin birth, even if that were a universally accepted doctrine among the Christians of his day. For it was essential to his system that Jesus should start on an equality with other men, except for a greater freedom of soul. Only so could imitation of Jesus on the part of other men insure a success equal to His. If Jesus were born of a virgin, then a fundamental difference of nature, as well as of character, between Him and other men would have to be assumed; and His followers could have no assurance that it was not that different nature, unattainable to others, which procured Him His victory over the powers of the world. Of course, it may be held that Carpocrates was correct in regarding Christianity as simply imitation of Jesus. But even then the whole character of his system, which is suffused with ideas of pagan philosophy, is hopelessly opposed to the view that such a correct interpretation of Christianity was anything more than a lucky speculation. He is a bold historian who would trace the line of true primitive Christian tradition through Carpocrates rather than through Ignatius or Justin. At any rate, Carpocrates cannot be regarded as a Christian, except in a very

⁴⁴ Irenaeus, *haer.* i. 25 (Stieren).

broad sense. His followers were only following out the teachings of their master, when they claimed to be equal to Jesus or even stronger than He.⁴⁵ Carpocrates' denial of the virgin birth is perhaps not so very much more significant than that of Celsus.

Cerinthus is discussed by Irenaeus⁴⁶ immediately after Carpocrates. That his life must have fallen in a very early period is indicated by the familiar tradition of his encounter with the Apostle John in the bath-house at Ephesus. Like Carpocrates, he was a Gnostic, and like Carpocrates he regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary. But he supposed that after the baptism the Christ descended upon the man Jesus and enabled Him to proclaim the unknown Father and perform miracles, only to leave Him again before the passion. It is widely held by modern scholars that the view which dated the Messiahship and divine sonship of Jesus from the coming of the Spirit at the baptism represented an intermediate stage between the historical, purely humanitarian view of Jesus and the fully developed doctrine of the virgin birth, which extended the divine sonship back to the very beginning of Jesus' human life. If such was the development, Cerinthus may seem to be a witness to that intermediate view which had not yet relinquished the purely human birth of Jesus.⁴⁷

Another explanation, however, will account equally well for the absence of the virgin birth in the teaching of Cerinthus. It has just been observed that Cerinthus supposed the Christ to have departed from Jesus before the passion. Will it be supposed that such a view is more primitive than the one which held the Christ to have suffered on the cross in order that He might be raised up in glory? Is it not more likely that the teaching of Cerinthus on this point was due

⁴⁵ Irenaeus, *haer.* i. 25, 2.

⁴⁶ *Haer.* i. 26.

⁴⁷ Cf. Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, i.² pp. 122ff. Usener places the Christology of Cerinthus between that of Carpocrates and the later doctrine of the Church as it appears in the virgin birth.

simply to a fear of bringing the Christ into too close relationship to the world and to sin? If so, then the same docetic interest will account for Cerinthus' rejection of the virgin birth, even supposing that to have been generally recognized in the Church of his day. Upon docetic principles, it was impossible for the Christ to be born at all, even from a virgin. Therefore, He must have been united with Jesus only subsequently. But if the man Jesus had no relation to the Christ until His baptism, then there was no reason why He should be supposed to have been born of a virgin. Indeed, there was a positive reason to the contrary. For birth from a virgin was felt to involve divine sonship. Hence, if Cerinthus had accepted the virgin birth he would have been required to accept such a real incarnation of the Son of God as his exemption of the Christ from the passion shows him to have been most of all anxious to avoid. The virgin birth, therefore, was thoroughly abhorrent to the principles of Cerinthus, and his denial of it may well have been due to philosophical prepossession rather than to historical tradition.⁴⁸

It may be objected that Cerinthus accepted the bodily resurrection of the man Jesus, even though he represented the Christ as having already departed from Jesus before the passion. Why should he have had any greater philosophical objection to the virgin birth of Jesus than he had to His resurrection? In reply, it should frankly be admitted, in the first place, that no matter how firmly established the belief in the virgin birth may have been in the time of Cerinthus, it was neither then nor at any other period of the Church regarded as quite equal in importance to the resurrection. A thinker who accepts the resurrection of Jesus without the virgin birth accepts more of Christianity and more of the canonical Gospel tradition than one who accepts the virgin birth without the resurrection; and it seems to have been the effort of many of the Gnostics to accept just

⁴⁸ Irenaeus, *loc. cit.*, says that Cerinthus denied the virgin birth because it seemed to him to be impossible ("impossibile enim hoc ei visum est"). Does this mean that the objections of Cerinthus were philosophical rather than historical?

as much of Christianity as they conveniently could. In the second place, it is not true that the virgin birth was no more inconsistent than the resurrection with the dualistic principles of Cerinthus. For the virgin birth, at least to a man of Greek training, if not to a Jew, involves divine sonship far more obviously than does the resurrection. Mat. i. 18-25 or Lk. i. 35 might well seem to Cerinthus to represent the supreme God as no more separate from the world than Zeus or the other divinities of Greek mythology; and if that representation were correct, then the whole dualistic system of Cerinthus fell to the ground.⁴⁹

The denials of the virgin birth that have thus far been discussed⁵⁰ are alike in that they each proceeded from a single individual. This circumstance has facilitated the psychological exhibition of the motives for such denials. The system of Marcion, for example, is a fairly definite thing, and it can easily be shown that the virgin birth was inconsistent with it. The case is widely different, however, with the class of denials of the virgin birth which must next

⁴⁹ It is no decisive objection to this argument that the Ophites of Irenaeus (*haer.* i. 30, 13), though they held that the Christ descended upon Jesus at the baptism and departed from Him before the crucifixion, accepted the virgin birth (see Usener, *op. cit.*, pp. 137ff.). For the compulsion exerted upon Gnostic sects by the tradition of the virgin birth might well have been less effective in one case than in another. Usener himself says (*op. cit.*, p. 138): "Man sieht wie die jungfräuliche geburt, nachdem sie in das schriftliche evangelium aufgenommen war, anerkennung heischte und selbst die widerstrebensten lehrgebäude des doketismus dazu zwang sich mit ihr auseinanderzusetzen, und wie die versuche der ausgleichung erst mühsam und ungeschickt, dann gewandter ausfallen." The only question is whether the contradiction did not arise on account of Gnostic innovations rather than (as Usener thinks) on account of innovations in the Gospel narratives.

⁵⁰ It is perfectly possible that other Gnostics besides the disciples of Carpocrates and Cerinthus denied the virgin birth. See Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 31f. With regard to the Gnostic Justin, the matter is perhaps not quite so clear as is sometimes assumed. It is not quite certain that Justin regarded Jesus as begotten by Joseph, though he speaks of Him (Hippol. *Philos.* v. 26, ed. Dunck. et Schneid., p. 226) as son of Joseph and Mary. At any rate, other Gnostics who denied the virgin birth are fully as unlikely as Carpocrates and Cerinthus to have been influenced in their denial by historical tradition.

be examined; for the authors of these denials can be grouped under no more specific heading than "Jewish Christians" or at the best "Ebionites".

At about the middle of the second century, Justin Martyr writes as follows:⁵¹ "And Trypho said, 'About these things also we have heard your opinion. So resume the discussion where you left it, and finish. For what you say seems to me to be paradoxical and incapable of proof; for when you say that this Christ preëxisted as God from eternity and then condescended to become man and be born, and that He is not a man proceeding from men, it seems to me that you are saying something that is not only paradoxical but also foolish.' And I said to this, 'I know that the statement seems to be paradoxical, and especially so to those of your race, who have never wished either to understand or to do the things of God, but rather the things of your teachers, as God Himself cries. Nevertheless, Trypho', I said, 'this person remains the Christ of God, even if I am not able to prove that He preëxisted as Son of the Maker of all things, and as God, and that He has been born as a man through the virgin. But if it is shown absolutely that this is the Christ of God, whoever He be, then even if I do not prove that He preëxisted, and condescended, in accordance with the Father's will, to be born as a man of like passions with us and with a fleshly nature, it is just to say merely that I have been deceived in this, but not to deny that this is the Christ, even if He is seen to have been born as a man from men and is proved to have become Christ by election. For indeed, my friends, there are some', I said, 'of your own race who confess that He is Christ but maintain that He was born a man from men; with whom I do not agree, nor would the majority of those who have come to the same way of thinking as I, since we have been commanded by Christ Himself to obey not human teachings but the things

⁵¹ *Dial.* 48. For the translation, some assistance has been received from Reith, in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*.

that were proclaimed through the blessed prophets and taught through Him.' "

At the beginning of the last sentence of the passage just quoted, the manuscripts have always until recently been held to read "of our race" instead of "of your race".⁵² Justin has accordingly been represented as saying: "Certain men of our race (that is, of the Christian Church) confess Jesus to be Christ even though they deny His virgin birth." Hence it has been argued that since Justin extends Christian fellowship to those who denied the virgin birth, it is evident that at the time of Justin the virgin birth had not yet become firmly established as an essential part of Christian belief. Other scholars, quite correctly, were unable to satisfy themselves with what in Justin would be an absolutely unparalleled designation of the Christians as "men of our race", and hence preferred, by a simple emendation of the text, to substitute "your race" for "our race".⁵³ "Your race" is in the *Dialogue* a common designation of the Jews and occurs in this immediate context. Never was an emendation more imperatively demanded. But fortunately it is quite unnecessary to marshal the arguments in defence of it. For the simple fact is that the primary manuscript of the *Dialogue*, which is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris,⁵⁴ does not read, as has always been assumed, "our race" but "your race". The far-reaching conclusions which have sometimes been based on the former reading, and the ingenious arguments in support of the latter, could alike have been avoided if one of the editors or other disputants had taken the trouble to examine the manuscript for himself.⁵⁵

⁵² ἀπο τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους instead of ἀπο τοῦ ὑμετέρου γένους.

⁵³ ὑμετέρου instead of ἡμετέρου.

⁵⁴ The only other extant manuscript is regarded as clearly secondary.

⁵⁵ To Harnack belongs the honor of the discovery (*Dogmengeschichte*, i.,⁴ 1909, p. 320). The present writer has also examined the manuscript, and can report that the reading ὑμετέρου is perfectly plain. There could never have been any doubt but that the first letter of the word is υ and not η. The whole trouble was apparently caused by a simple careless blunder of the first publisher, Stephanus, which has been copied by all subsequent editors.

Accordingly, Justin does not say that those who denied the virgin birth were Christians; and indeed it has already been shown on the contrary that he regarded the virgin birth as one of the absolutely fundamental things which the Christian apologist must defend. What he does say is that the Jew is illogical in rejecting the Messiahship of Jesus simply because he felt obliged to reject the virgin birth. If the Jew could be induced to see that he was wrong at least about the Messiahship, then he might finally be convinced of his error about the virgin birth as well. Compared with full Christianity, and in itself, that mere recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus probably seemed to Justin entirely inadequate, but compared with the hostility of the Jews, and regarded simply and solely as a stepping-stone to higher things, it might serve Justin's immediate purpose.

The information to be derived from the passage is, therefore, simply that at the time of Justin there were certain men of Jewish descent who though they accepted Jesus as the Messiah regarded Him as merely human and born in the ordinary human way.⁵⁶ Certainly Justin does not say that *all* Jewish Christians denied the virgin birth.⁵⁷ Indeed Justin's indefinite form of expression may seem to suggest exactly the opposite.⁵⁸ In the passage just preceding (Chapter 47), Justin has been discussing the Jewish Christians at some length, and has divided them into two classes, according to their position with regard to the necessity of Gentile Christian observance of the Mosaic law. Here, however, he refers to these believers in the Messiahship of Jesus as though they were entirely independent of the

⁵⁶ ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον.

⁵⁷ Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 33, is entirely unwarranted in saying that the only Jewish Christians whom Justin knows were Jewish Christians who were not convinced of the virgin birth.

⁵⁸ Cf. Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 671, Anm. 2: "Dann (if *νυμετερον* be read) aber erfordert der Satz den Gegensatz, dass es auch solche Juden, d.h. hier Judenchristen gibt, welche Christum keineswegs für einen aus Menschen erzeugten Menschen halten." But it may be doubted whether the contrast implied in the word *τινες* itself is not simply with all other Jews rather than with all other Jewish Christians.

Jewish Christians whom he has just been discussing. If he had meant that all of those Jewish Christians, of both parties, rejected the virgin birth, surely he would have used some other expression than "certain men of your race". The reader has rather the impression that these "certain men" of Chapter 48 are comparatively few in number, and were left entirely out of account in the general division of Jewish Christianity which was set up in Chapter 47. Apparently Justin has to inform the Jews about those among their own number who denied the virgin birth and yet accepted the Messiahship of Jesus. The Jews had apparently jumped at the conclusion that in attacking the virgin birth they were attacking Christianity itself. This passage, therefore, far from indicating that Justin knew no Jewish Christians except those who denied the virgin birth,⁵⁹ proves rather that in the time of Justin the Jewish Christian opponents of the virgin birth were so insignificant as to be ignored even by their own countrymen. The Jews regarded belief in the virgin birth as characteristic of Christianity.

These rejecters of the virgin birth could hardly be included in that milder group of Jewish Christians whom Justin recognized as Christian brothers. For, in the first place, as has been emphasized above,⁶⁰ Justin regarded the virgin birth as one of the fundamental facts about Christ. In the second place, it should be observed that these "certain men" of Chapter 48 denied not only the virgin birth but also the divinity of Christ and apparently the preëxistence. Whatever might be thought of those who rejected the virgin birth, it is hardly likely that those who denied altogether the higher nature of Christ could ever be received by Justin into Christian fellowship.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Bauer, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁰ P. 533.

⁶¹ But *cf.* Hilgenfeld, *Judenthum und Judenchristenthum*, 1888, p. 39. In concluding the discussion of Justin, it may be remarked that the real difficulty in *dial.* 48 lies in the last sentence, where the οὐδ' ἂν πλείστοι ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἶποιεν is very obscure. Conybeare, at any rate, is very rash when he interprets the passage as implying that

Accordingly, the indications are that at the time of Justin some of the Jewish Christians⁶² accepted the virgin birth while others did not. Such a divided condition of Jewish Christianity appears, at any rate, clearly in the writings of Origen, in the former half of the third century.

In Origen's allegorical exegesis of the healing of the blind man (or the two blind men) at Jericho,⁶³ the blind beggar represents Jewish Christianity in its spiritual poverty. Jewish Christians show their poverty by the low view which they hold of the person of Christ; like the beggar they address Jesus as "son of David" instead of by some higher title. They either suppose Him to have been born of Joseph and Mary, or else, admitting His birth from Mary and the divine Spirit, they deny His divinity.⁶⁴ The Gentile Christians rebuke the Jewish Christians for their low view of the person of Christ, as the crowd rebuked the beggar for his cry of "Son of David". The beggar, however, cried out all the more, and Jesus honored his real though inadequate faith by commanding him to be brought near. Then the beggar bethought himself of a higher title than "Son of David" and said "Rabbouni". Not till then did the Saviour grant the restoration of sight. That lower view of the person of Christ is, therefore, according to Origen insufficient; but it may serve as a stepping-stone to a more adequate faith.⁶⁵

In this passage, apparently the only Jewish Christianity which Origen has in view is one which could be regarded by the crowds of Gentile Christians who were following after Jesus as an "Israelitish remnant sitting by the way".

"the majority of Christians were more open to historical considerations and less ready than Justin to sacrifice them to a *priori* prophetic constructions" (*Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 180f.).

⁶² It is convenient to use the term "Christian" in a broad sense to include all professing Christians.

⁶³ *In evangelium Matth.*, Tom. xvi. 10ff. (Lommatsch iv. pp. 32ff.).

⁶⁴ ὅτε μὲν ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ οἰομένων αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὅτε δὲ ἐκ Μαρίας μὲν μόνῃς καὶ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, οὐ μὴν καὶ μετὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ θεολογίας.

⁶⁵ Cf. above, p. 549.

Yet even among men who held such a low, humanitarian view of the person of Christ, there were not wanting some who accepted the virgin birth,

In the fifth book of Origen's treatise against Celsus,⁶⁶ Origen answers the charge of Celsus that the Christians do not differ from the Jews as follows: "Suppose there *are* some who receive Jesus and on this ground boast that they are Christians, and yet wish to live according to the Jews' law like the mass of the Jews (and these are the two fold sect of Ebionites, who either acknowledge with us that Jesus was born of a virgin, or deny this, and maintain that he was begotten like other human beings⁶⁷)—what does this fact establish against those of the Church, whom Celsus has designated 'those of the multitude'?"⁶⁸ The name "Ebionites"⁶⁹ which is here applied to these heretical Jewish Christians, was alluded to in the passage just cited from the *Commentary on Matthew*. The incidental use of the phrase, "the twofold Ebionites",⁷⁰ seems to show that the division between those Ebionites who denied the virgin birth and those who accepted it was no mere unimportant or fluctuat-

⁶⁶ *Contr. Cels.* v. 61.

⁶⁷ The translation of this parenthesis is that of Crombie, in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*.

⁶⁸ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους. The translation of this phrase has been taken from Crombie, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁹ Origen, *de princip.* iv. 22, derives the name from the Hebrew עֲבִיּוֹן "poor", and interprets it of the spiritual poverty of the sect. Perhaps it was originally a name used among the Jews for Christians in general, or else it may have been applied in a good sense by the Ebionites themselves. Tertullian and others supposed that Ebion was the name of the founder of the sect, but this hypothesis, despite the vigorous defence of it by Hilgenfeld (*cf.* also Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, English Translation, pp. 52f., footnote 3), has now been generally abandoned.

⁷⁰ οἱ διττοὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι. *Cf. contr. Cels.* v. 65 Ἐβιωναῖοι ἀμφότεροι.

⁷¹ Harnack is therefore venturing on doubtful ground when he says (*op. cit.*, i. 4 p. 323: "[Es giebt]—von synkretistischen (gnostischen) Judenchristen abgesehen—nur eine mannigfach schattirte Gruppe von Judenchristen, die sich selbst sowohl Nazaräer als Ebioniten von Anfang an genannt hat." *Cf.* Harnack, *Chronologie*, ii. p. 633, Anm. 1, Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 664, Anm. 2, McGiffert, *The Church History of Eusebius*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, on iii. 27, note 1.

ing one.⁷¹ The same division appears in Eusebius.⁷² In Epiphanius and Jerome, the terminology (at least) differs, for by these writers those who accepted the virgin birth are called Nazarenes⁷³, while the name Ebionites is reserved for those who denied the virgin birth.⁷⁴ Epiphanius' terminology has been followed by some scholars (for example by Zahn), "Nazarenes" being used for the more orthodox and milder class of Ebionites, "Ebionites" for the less orthodox. Whatever terminology be adopted, at least so much is fairly plain—from the time of Origen to the time of Epiphanius, there were two parties among the schismatic Jewish Christians, one of which denied the virgin birth, while the other accepted it.⁷⁵ It is true that Irenaeus and following him Hippolytus mention only Ebionites who reject the virgin birth; but their failure to mention the other division of Jewish Christians does not prove that it did not exist at the time when they wrote. For, in the first place, the less pronouncedly heretical character of those Jewish Christians who accepted the virgin birth might well cause them to be omitted from a catalogue of heresies;⁷⁶ and in the second place, Irenaeus and Hippolytus, since they lived in the West, can hardly be expected to give minute information about Jewish Christianity.

⁷² *Hist. eccl.* iii. 27.

⁷³ This term, Epiphanius says (*haer.* xxix. 1), was originally applied to Christians in general.

⁷⁴ When Jerome says that the Nazarenes accepted the virgin birth, he is apparently contrasting them with the Ebionites. Apparently he does not say in so many words that the Ebionites denied it.

⁷⁵ It should be noticed that Origen regards both classes of Ebionites as standing outside the limits of the Catholic Church: he blames Celsus for confusing these errorists with "the men of the Church" (τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας).

⁷⁶ Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* vi. 17, characterizes the Ebionites in general as those who deny the virgin birth, although in *hist. eccl.* iii. 27 he has mentioned Ebionites who accept it. Cf. also Origen, *hom. in Luc.* xvii (Lomm. v. p. 148), with the passages mentioned above, where Origen clearly divides the Ebionites into two classes according as they accepted or rejected the virgin birth. Cf. McGiffert on Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* iii. 27, note 15, where the passage, *hom. in Luc.* xvii, is mentioned.

Which of these two classes of Jewish Christians seems better fitted to preserve the correct tradition about the birth of Jesus? . Unfortunately, the first detailed information, at least about the more orthodox group, dates only from the latter half of the fourth century. It will be convenient to start from that point and work backwards.

In the latter half of the fourth century, the Ebionites, or less orthodox class of Jewish Christians, who denied the virgin birth, are described in some detail by Epiphanius. His account^{76a} is far from clear, and must be used with great caution. Despite his faults, however, Epiphanius has evidently preserved valuable information about the Ebionites which without him would have been lost.

According to Epiphanius, Ebion started from the sect of the Nazarenes, and began his special teaching after the destruction of Jerusalem, east of the Jordan, where the Nazarenes also had their seat. The Ebionites followed the Jewish law, and in washings even went beyond the Jews. In general, the Ebionites are divided into factions. Elxai^{76b} introduced confusion. The Ebionites regard the sexual relation as impure,⁷⁷ and therefore do not partake of animal food.⁷⁸ Jesus they hold to have been begotten of a human father;⁷⁹ the Christ came down upon Him in the form of a dove. The Christ was not begotten by God the Father, but was created like one of the archangels, though greater than

^{76a} *Haer.* xxx.

^{76b} The Elkesaites have generally been regarded as Gnostic Jewish Christians. But according to Brandt, *Elchasaï*, 1912, the sect was at first not Christian at all, but simply Jewish (Elxai, Brandt believes, was a real individual, who in the reign of Trajan produced, at least in substance, the book that bears his name). If the older view be held, it is not quite impossible that the virgin birth was taught in the Elxai book (Hippol., *Philos.*, ix. 14, x. 29).

⁷⁷ Yet Epiphanius also says that the Ebionites permit a plurality of marriages. The latter practice, he says (*haer.* xxx. 2), was a later development.

⁷⁸ ἐμψύχων.

⁷⁹ ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρός. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 31, is apparently mistaken when he says that Epiphanius represents the Ebionites as divided on the question of the birth of Jesus.

they. Christ came to abolish sacrifices. The Ebionites repudiate the work of Paul, and reject some of the Old Testament prophets.

The Ebionites use exclusively a single gospel, which Epiphanius describes as a mutilated Matthew. They themselves call it the Hebrew Gospel, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews. One of the fragments which Epiphanius has preserved refers to the apostles in the first person; the apostles are therefore perhaps represented as the authors of the book. Hence the gospel might well be called the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, and has therefore often been identified with the work which is mentioned under this title by Origen.⁸⁰ The same fragment explains how the gospel came to be called a Gospel of Matthew, for Matthew is singled out by Jesus for direct address.⁸¹ He could be regarded, therefore, as the representative of the other apostles in the composition of the book.⁸²

The fragments which have been preserved by Epiphanius are amply sufficient to indicate the character of the gospel. It is a worthless Greek compilation based on our canonical Gospels.⁸³ It contained no account of the birth and infancy

⁸⁰ See Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 728ff. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 37 Band Heft 1, 1911, pp. 170ff., protests vigorously against the identification.

⁸¹ καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον.

⁸² See Zahn, *loc. cit.*

⁸³ That it is dependent on our Greek Gospels and was itself originally written in Greek is proved by the substitution of ἐγκρίς "cake" (in a description of the μέλι ἄγριον on the basis of Num. xi. 8) for ἀκρίς "locust" in the account of the food of John the Baptist. The change is due to the vegetarian principles of the author (see Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 733), which also led him to change Lk. xxii. 15 Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν into Μὴ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν; . The Ebionite opposition to sacrifices appears in the gospel in the supposed saying of Jesus, Ἥλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἔαν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή. Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 193f., supposes that this citation was constructed by Epiphanius out of materials provided by the Clementine *Journeys of Peter* and that therefore it does not properly

of Jesus, but incidentally displays dependence upon the first chapter of Luke, and perhaps also upon the second chapter of Matthew.⁸⁴ In the account of the baptism, the three forms of the voice from heaven which were current in the second century are simply placed side by side.⁸⁵ ✕

From the confused and contradictory statements of Epiphanius, at least so much would seem to be clear—that the Ebionites as he describes them were not simply Pharisaic Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah, but were strongly affected by Gnostic ideas. Their rejection of parts of the Old Testament, their views about sacrifice, and their interpretation of the event at the baptism would seem to place the matter beyond doubt.⁸⁶

Hence the question arises whether the sect which is described by Epiphanius is not entirely distinct from all of the Ebionites mentioned by Jerome and by the earlier writers, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen and Eusebius. The Ebionites of Jerome are not charged with any peculiarly Gnostic doc-

belong among the fragments of the gospel of the Ebionites. Cf. below, p. 576 and footnote 145.

⁸⁴ It is said of John the Baptist, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους 'Ααρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ 'Ελισάβετ. Perhaps the historical error at the beginning of the gospel, 'Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις 'Ηρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς 'Ιουδαίας ἦλθεν 'Ιωάννης βαπτίζων arose from a thoughtless repetition of the ἐν ἡμέραις 'Ηρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως of Mt. ii. 1. Since the author of this gospel omitted the first two chapters of Matthew, the ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις with which Matthew introduces his account of John the Baptist became meaningless, and the author simply turned back to Mt. ii. 1 for an explanation of ἐκείναις without stopping to think that Mt. ii. 1 refers to a much earlier time. See Nicholson, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, 1879, p. 15.

⁸⁵ Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα, "σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ἠυδόκησα" (approximately Westcott and Hort's text in Mark and Luke), καὶ πάλιν "ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε" (Western text in Luke). Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. ὃν ἰδὼν (φησὶν) ὁ 'Ιωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· "σὺ τίς εἶ, κύριε;" καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· "οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν ἠυδόκησα" (approximately Westcott and Hort's text in Matthew).

⁸⁶ Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-242, attributes the apparent Gnostic character of the Ebionites of Epiphanius simply to the undue use which Epiphanius made of the Clementine *Journeys of Peter* as a source for information about the sect. See below, p. 576.

trines; apparently they differ from the Nazarenes merely by a stricter Judaism and a lower view of the person of Christ. The same may be said of the more unorthodox of Eusebius' two classes; and both classes of Origen's Ebionites seem to be blamed for a grovelling, inadequate opinion about Jesus rather than for unlawful speculations. In Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the matter is perhaps not quite so clear. In the first place, if Irenaeus' assertion that the opinion of the Ebionites about the Lord was similar to those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates is to be taken strictly, it involves the Ebionites in speculations that transcend Pharisaic Judaism. Philastrius, in reproducing the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, brings the Ebionites into even closer relation with Cerinthus.⁸⁷ But it should be noticed that Irenaeus mentions Carpocrates as well as Cerinthus in this connection, although the views of the two men about the person of Christ were very considerably different. Therefore, when it is said that the Ebionites held similar views to those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, the similarity must be interpreted rather broadly. In the second place, however, Irenaeus says of the Ebionites: "Quae autem sunt prophetica, curiosius exponere nituntur." If, as has been suggested,^{87a} this means that the Ebionites sought to determine what things are prophetic, then a marked parallel has been discovered between these Ebionites and the Gnostic Ebionites of Epiphanius, who exercised criticism on the Old Testament. And perhaps the failure of Origen, Eusebius and Jerome to mention the Gnostic doctrines of the Ebionites does not prove that those doctrines did not exist.

This evidence for the Gnostic character of the Ebionites mentioned by the earlier writers is far from amounting to anything like positive proof. The common view that the

⁸⁷ Philastrius, c. ix (in the *Vienna Corpus*, vol. xxxviii. p. 20): "Ebion discipulus eius Cerinthis, in multis ei similiter errans saluatorem nostrum hominem de Joseph natum carnaliter aestimabat, nihilque divinitatis in eo fuisse docebat," etc.

^{87a} See Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, 1844, pp. 494ff. Cf. Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 226f.

Gnostic Ebionites of Epiphanius are to be distinguished from the Pharisaic Ebionites of Irenaeus remains, to say the least, perfectly possible. But the other view, which would attribute to the Ebionites of Irenaeus at least the germs of the peculiar doctrines described by Epiphanius, is also possible. It should be remembered that the extant descriptions of the Ebionites from the period before Epiphanius are very scanty, and that some of them come from men who had little opportunity for observation. To an outsider, the insistence of the Ebionites upon forms and ceremonies in general might be more noticeable than the exact difference of their ceremonies from those of the ordinary Jews; and their humanitarian views about Jesus might be more noticeable than their peculiar speculations about the Christ. Thus it is not quite impossible that all the Ebionites who denied the virgin birth were adherents of the Gnostic sect described by Epiphanius. The Elxai book was probably produced at an early time; so that Gnostic Ebionism, even if based from the beginning upon that book,⁸⁸ may have originated before the time of Justin Martyr.⁸⁹

The Nazarenes, of the time of Epiphanius and Jerome, must next be considered. The account of them given by Epiphanius is evidently not based upon personal observation; but Jerome, during his residence in the East, may well

⁸⁸ If Ebionism, though at first independent of Elxai, accepted the Elxai book later on, that fact would seem to indicate some original affinity for its contents; so that even pre-Elkesaite Ebionism would perhaps not be altogether unlike the Ebionites of Epiphanius. The whole question is, however, very obscure.

⁸⁹ Cf. the combination of an insistence upon Jewish observances with docetism in the errorists of the Ignatian epistles. See *Magn.* viii, with Lightfoot's note. This elimination of all non-Gnostic Jewish Christianity that denied the virgin birth is apparently favored by Zahn, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 56. In opposition, see Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. p. 633, Anm. 1. For the view of Schmidtke, see below pp. 574ff. Whether Symmachus, who translated the Old Testament into Greek (perhaps about 200 A. D.) was an Ebionite, is apparently not altogether certain. Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, p. 236, Anm. 2, regards him simply as a Jew. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* i.⁴ pp. 322, Anm. 2, 327, Anm. 1, assigns him to the Gnostic branch of the Ebionites.

have come into close contact with them,⁹⁰ and therefore the scattered remarks about them in his writings deserve careful notice.

According to Jerome, the Nazarenes, who are scattered throughout all the synagogues of the East,⁹¹ continue the observance of the Jewish law,⁹² they try to be both Jews and Christians and therefore fail of being either, they seek to put new wine into old bottles.⁹³ Yet they are to be estimated higher than the Ebionites, who merely pretend to be Christians.⁹⁴ Whereas the Ebionites repudiate Paul as being a transgressor of the law,⁹⁵ the Nazarenes regard the preaching of Paul as a manifestation of the light that lightened the Gentiles (Is. ix).⁹⁶ And they recognize the divine sonship and virgin birth of Jesus.⁹⁷

The Nazarenes used only one gospel, which was written in Aramaic.⁹⁸ A copy was preserved in the library at Caesarea, and Jerome was also permitted by the Nazarenes at Beroea in Syria to copy the gospel. Indeed, he even says that he made a Greek and a Latin translation of it. Despite the knowledge of its contents which he claims to possess and the frequent mention of it in his writings, his various designations of the gospel have given a great deal of trouble. At times, he calls it the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the gospel which is called that according to the Hebrews; at other times, he speaks of it as though it were the Aramaic original of the Gospel of Matthew. Once he designates it

⁹⁰ Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 246ff., however, denies with very considerable show of reason that Jerome had ever come into contact with the Nazarenes at all.

⁹¹ In criticism of this statement, see Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 249ff.

⁹² Ed. Vall., iv. 122.

⁹³ i. 747, v. 161.

⁹⁴ i. 746.

⁹⁵ vii. 75.

⁹⁶ iv. 130.

⁹⁷ i. 747.

⁹⁸ "Chaldaico quidem syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis" (ii. 782). For the materials for studying the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the present article is dependent especially upon Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. pp. 642-723.

as the gospel which is called by many⁹⁹ the authentic Gospel of Matthew. The fullest single designation of the gospel is the following:¹⁰⁰ "In evangelio iuxta Hebraeos, quod chaldaico quidem syroque sermone, sed hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos sive, ut plerique autumant iuxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca." The following is a possible explanation of this vacillation in Jerome's manner of speaking of the gospel.¹⁰¹ Jerome had found an Aramaic gospel in use among the Nazarenes, which in part was parallel to our Greek Matthew. According to an early and wide-spread tradition, Matthew had written his Gospel originally in Aramaic ("Hebrew"). It was therefore natural at first sight to suppose that the Nazarene gospel was nothing less than the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew. Yet, as a matter of fact, there were wide differences between that Nazarene gospel and our Matthew; so that if that gospel were the original Matthew, then our Matthew must be anything but a faithful translation. Jerome did not venture to draw this conclusion. Yet he could not bear to relinquish the appearance of being the only man in the Church who had in his hands the genuine Aramaic Matthew; and indeed in many cases the Greek Matthew could really be admirably interpreted by regarding the corresponding passages in the Nazarene gospel as the original. Accordingly, where our Matthew and the Nazarene gospel are parallel, Jerome treats the Nazarene gospel as the original Aramaic Matthew; where the two gospels differ decisively, he calls the Nazarene gospel by some other name, such as "Gospel according to the Hebrews".

The Gospel according to the Hebrews is cited by Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius, all of whom had first-hand acquaintance with its contents. It was also used by

⁹⁹ "plerisque" (vii. 77).

¹⁰⁰ ii. 782.

¹⁰¹ See Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 634f.; and cf. Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 684f., Ropes, *Sprüche Jesu*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 14 Band Heft 2, pp. 84f.

Hegesippus and perhaps by Ignatius. By Origen it is evidently distinguished from the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, which has been discussed above. The latter Origen reckons among the apocryphal gospels—it is one of the “attempts” to which Luke alludes in his prologue; whereas the Gospel according to the Hebrews is apparently treated by Origen with respect,¹⁰² though not as equal in authority to the four canonical Gospels. Formerly, it was supposed that a connection of some kind existed between the two Jewish Christian gospels—for instance, that the Ebionite gospel was a later recension of the Nazarene gospel, or that the two were different recensions of a common ancestor—but the investigations of Zahn, Handmann and Harnack have caused the two to be regarded as entirely separate works.

The external evidence makes it highly probable that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was written not later than the beginning of the second century; Harnack favors a first-century date.¹⁰³ With regard to the relation of the work to the canonical Gospels, widely different views have been held. Baur supposed that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the starting-point for the whole development of the Gospel history; others have held it to be based upon our Greek Gospels; others have held intermediate views of various kinds. Zahn supposes that it was developed from the original Aramaic Matthew, but except from the purely linguistic point of view reproduces the original far less faithfully than our Greek Matthew. Harnack would regard it as independent of the Greek Matthew, partly more original, partly less original. Handmann identifies it with the *Logia*, one of the two common sources of our Matthew and Luke. The problems of the gospel cannot here be solved. But at least so much is clear—despite some things that look like fantastic elaborations of the Gospel history,¹⁰⁴ the Gospel according

¹⁰² Cf. however Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 154ff.

¹⁰³ Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 635ff., is probably right in his contention (against Zahn) that a Greek translation of the gospel existed long before Jerome, though Jerome did not see it.

¹⁰⁴ The primitive character of the remarkable fragment (the fourth

to the Hebrews contains tradition at least of great antiquity, and is the most interesting of the non-canonical gospels of which any considerable fragments have been preserved. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of complete indifference whether or not this gospel contained an account of the virgin birth; and this question must therefore now be discussed.

In the first place, the designation of the gospel as the Gospel of Matthew by Jerome and Epiphanius is better explained if it contained something corresponding to Mt. i-ii. The omission of two chapters at the beginning would have far more effect in producing the impression of a different work than very much greater divergences in the middle. If the gospel began with the baptism, like Mark, why should the report of it which came to Epiphanius have connected it so specifically with Matthew, and represented it furthermore as a "very complete"¹⁰⁵ Matthew? It is true that Epiphanius himself did not understand wherein the completeness consisted—he is doubtful whether the gospel contained the genealogy and does not know whether the readers of the gospel accepted the virgin birth—but this very lack of understanding shows that Epiphanius did not invent the designation "very complete". It was part of the indefinite report which was his only source of knowledge about the gospel. In order to explain Jerome's half-conviction that the gospel was nothing less than the Aramaic Matthew, the presence of a beginning corresponding to Mt. i-ii is even more imperatively required.

This requirement would perhaps be partially satisfied if the gospel, though omitting all mention of the virgin birth, contained the genealogy of Mt. i.¹⁰⁶ This hypothesis, how-

in Zahn's list), preserved both by Origen and by Jerome, Ἀρτι ἔλαβέ με (i. e. Jesus) ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπὴννεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ, has never been successfully defended.

¹⁰⁵ πληρέστατον.

¹⁰⁶ This view has been held by Hilgenfeld, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1863, p. 353, *Evangelium sec. Hebraeos*, pp. 15ff., Handmann, *Das Hebräer-Evangelium*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 5 Band Heft 3, 1888, pp. 123, 138. Aside from the considerations just

ever, is certainly incorrect. For if the gospel contained the genealogy without alluding to the virgin birth, then the genealogy must have ended with some such sentence as "Joseph begat Jesus". But if the gospel contained such a sentence as that without correction or explanation, it certainly could not have been treated with favor by Origen, Eusebius and Jerome, every one of whom had independent and first-hand knowledge of its contents.¹⁰⁷ Even if Hilgenfeld were correct in supposing that those Jewish Christian readers of the gospel who accepted the virgin birth could explain "Joseph begat Jesus" in harmony with the virgin birth,¹⁰⁸ certainly Origen and Eusebius (who had accepted the fourfold Gospel canon and were in no way prejudiced in favor of the Gospel according to the Hebrews) and the many Catholic Christians to whose opinion they seem to bear testimony could not and would not have done so. At the time of Eusebius, no Catholic Christian would have placed a gospel which closed the genealogy with "Joseph begat Jesus" in any other category than in that of the decidedly spurious books. It is absolutely certain, therefore, that if the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained no mention of the virgin birth it also contained no genealogy. But if it contained no genealogy, it must have had a very different appearance at

mentioned in the text, the presence of the genealogy in the Gospel according to the Hebrews is thought to be favored by the statement of Epiphanius (*haer.* xxx. 3, 14) that Cerinthus and Carpocrates used the genealogy of Matthew to prove that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. But there is no real reason whatever for supposing that Cerinthus and Carpocrates used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There is some evidence from Irenaeus (iii. 11, 7) that Cerinthus adopted the Gospel of Mark. See Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 33f., Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 730f., Anm. 1, and especially Schmidtké, *op. cit.*, pp. 209ff.

¹⁰⁷ See Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 686.

¹⁰⁸ Hilgenfeld, *Evangelium sec. Hebraeos*, p. 19: "qui partum virginis concedebant Matth. hebr. I, 16 ad arbitrium interpretati videntur esse." For a Jew it was perfectly possible to understand the word "begat" in a putative rather than physical sense. "If the Genealogy had ended with the uncompromising statement 'and Joseph begat Jesus' it would not prove that the Evangelist believed that Joseph had been the natural father of Jesus" (Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. p. 261). Similarly Allen, in *Internat. Crit. Com.*, on Mt. i. 16.

the very beginning from the Gospel of Matthew, and could hardly have been brought into such close connection with that Gospel by Epiphanius and Jerome.¹⁰⁹

In the second place, the character of the readers of the gospel is not unfavorable to the supposition that it contained an account of the virgin birth. Jerome found it in use among the Nazarenes, who accepted the virgin birth.¹¹⁰ Apparently Epiphanius did not find it in use among the Ebionites, who denied the virgin birth; they used the very different gospel of which Epiphanius has preserved fragments. Eusebius¹¹¹ assigns the Gospel according to the Hebrews to the less unorthodox Ebionites, who accepted the virgin birth. In fact, there is no clear evidence that this gospel was ever used by men who held Jesus to have been the son of Joseph and Mary. Irenaeus,¹¹² it is true, says that the Ebionites, who denied the virgin birth, used only the Gospel according to Matthew, but there is no real reason for identifying this supposed Matthew with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The only possible way of arriving at that identification is by a process of elimination. The only two specifically Jewish Christian gospels that are known—at any rate the only two that are known ever to have been called by the name of Matthew—are the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the gospel of the Ebionites as described by Epiphanius. Therefore, since the gospel used by the Ebionites of Irenaeus cannot possibly have been the gospel of the Ebionites of Epiphanius, it must have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But is it so certain that the gospel in question was not the gospel of the Ebionites of Epiphanius? If the considerations adduced above¹¹³ have any weight

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 686.

¹¹⁰ In one passage (vii. 77) he speaks of it as the gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, but here he is probably inaccurate. Cf. Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, p. 167. Jerome seems never to have come into close relations with the Ebionites.

¹¹¹ By the most probable interpretation of *hist. eccl.* iii. 27. See, however, for a criticism of this passage, Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 143ff.

¹¹² i. 26, 2.

¹¹³ Pp. 556ff.

whatever, then the purely Pharisaic and non-Gnostic character of these Ebionites of Irenaeus is not so certain as is usually assumed; and if their teaching contained the germs of the Gnostic doctrines professed by the Ebionites of Epiphanius, then they may already have possessed that same Ebionite gospel.¹¹⁴ But even if the identification with the gospel of the Ebionites be abandoned, the identification with the Gospel according to the Hebrews does not necessarily follow. For the Ebionites mentioned by Irenaeus may have used some gospel which has been lost; or they may have adapted the canonical Matthew to their peculiar doctrines in some such way as Marcion adapted Luke. The statement of Irenaeus remains puzzling. But manifestly he is guilty of error or incompleteness of one kind or another, for the Ebionites could not have received the Gospel of Matthew as we know it (and as Irenaeus knew it); and inferences drawn from such an erroneous statement cannot be allowed to nullify clearer evidence.¹¹⁵

In the third place, there is some positive evidence that the Gospel according to the Hebrews as known to Jerome did contain a narrative corresponding to the second chapter of Matthew.¹¹⁶

In the commentary on Matthew, Jerome says:¹¹⁷ "Librarium hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primum

¹¹⁴ Schmidtke, who denies the Gnostic character of the users of the Ebionite gospel, believes that that gospel is the one referred to by Irenaeus (*op. cit.*, p. 225). But *cf.* Harnack, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 628, 630f.

¹¹⁵ What gospel was used by the Jewish Christian opponents of the virgin birth mentioned by Justin Martyr and by Origen? It would be over-bold to answer that it was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, simply because no other definite answer can be given. In view of the scantiness of the sources, no definite answer can reasonably be expected.

¹¹⁶ For the following argument, see Nicholson, *op. cit.*, pp. 31ff., and especially Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 652f. (Anm.), 687f. (Anm.). For the opposite view, see Hilgenfeld, *loc. cit.*, Ropes, *op. cit.*, pp. 86ff., Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 643f., Anm. 2, Handmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 119ff. Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 276ff., though he supposes that Jerome's Aramaic gospel contained Mt. i-ii, regards as valueless the positive proofs now to be adduced.

¹¹⁷ vii. 14. With regard to Ἰουδαίως Mt. ii. 5.

editum, sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus 'Iudae' non 'Iudaeae'. Quae est enim aliarum gentium Bethlehem, ut ad distinctionem eius hic Iudaeae poneretur? Iudae autem idcirco scribitur, quia est alia Bethlehem in Galilaea. Lege librum Jesu filii Naue. Denique et in ipso testimonio, quod de Michaeae prophetia sumptum est, ita habetur, 'et tu Bethlehem, terra Juda'." Here the most natural interpretation makes "ipso Hebraico" refer¹¹⁸ to Jerome's Hebrew Matthew, that is, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. If "ipsum Hebraicum" had been mentioned in the comment on the citation Mt. ii. 6, then it might well have referred to the original Hebrew of the Old Testament passage from which the citation is taken; but Mt. ii. 5 is not a citation, and in connection with it "ipsum Hebraicum" means most naturally the original "Hebrew" (Aramaic) of the Greek Gospel. The passage, therefore, seems to show that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained Mt. ii. 5. It must be admitted, however, that the interpretation which refers "ipso Hebraico" to the Hebrew Old Testament is not impossible. According to that interpretation, Jerome would mean: "Not only does 'Iudae' stand in the original Old Testament passage upon which the scribes based their answer, but also when it comes to the actual citation of the passage even our Greek Gospel in its present form has 'Iudae'. Therefore 'Iudae' must have stood in the original text of the Gospel even in verse 5."^{118a} An objection to this view is afforded by the circumstance that the description of the Old Testament passage, "quod de Michaeae prophetia sumptum est," comes only in the comment on the citation. If "ipso Hebraico" referred to the Micah passage, the description would naturally have been given in connection with that phrase.

In the *De viris illustribus*, the following passage occurs:¹¹⁹ "Matthaeus qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Iudaea, propter eos qui ex circumcisione credider-

¹¹⁸ As in *de vir. ill.*, c. 3.

^{118a} See Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 276f.

¹¹⁹ *De vir. inl.*, c. 3, ed. Richardson.

unt, *Evangelium* Christi Hebraeis litteris verbisque composuit; quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis qui in Beroea, urbe Syriae, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit. In quo animadvertendum quod ubicumque evangelista, sive ex persona sua sive ex Domini Salvatoris veteris scripturae testimoniis abutitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem, sed Hebraicum. E quibus illa duo sunt: 'Ex Aegypto vocavi Filium meum', et, 'Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur.' " The most natural reference of "in quo" in the middle of this passage is to the "hoc volumine" which immediately precedes. Jerome says that in the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew he has observed that the Evangelist in his Old Testament citations always follows not the Septuagint but the Hebrew text. Examples of such citations are "Out of Egypt have I called my son,"¹²⁰ and "For he shall be called a Nazarene."¹²¹ Harnack himself admits that if Jerome were an honest and reliable writer, this passage would show that the verses Mt. ii. 15, 23 were contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But, Harnack continues, since Jerome was not an honest and reliable writer, the very ambiguity of the passage suggests that he is trying to appear to have the key to the two puzzling citations in his hand, without definitely committing himself. In the commentary on Is. xi. 1, he does not appeal to the Gospel according to the Hebrews but to "eruditi Hebraeorum" for the information that Mt. ii. 23 comes from that passage. But surely this last argument is without value. As Zahn has pointed out,¹²² if an Aramaic equivalent for Mt. ii. 23 stood in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it would still require all the learning of those "eruditi Hebraeorum" to show that this was derived from Is. xi. 1. The connection

¹²⁰ Mt. ii. 15.

¹²¹ Mt. ii. 23.

¹²² *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 688.

with Is. xi. 1 might be more plausible on the basis of the Aramaic of Mt. ii. 23 than on the basis of the Greek, but surely it would not be self-evident. Ropes, in a very acute discussion of the passage,¹²³ makes the antecedent of "quo"¹²⁴ not the Hebrew Matthew, but the Gospel of Matthew in general. Under this interpretation, the words from "in quo" on are intended as a second confirmation for the fact of a Hebrew original of Matthew, which was affirmed in the first sentence of the paragraph. Schmidtke interprets "in quo" adverbially.¹²⁵ It may freely be admitted that if it could be shown on other grounds that Mt. ii. 5, 15, 23 did not as a matter of fact stand in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, then both this passage and the remark on Mt. ii. 5 could be interpreted in harmony with that fact. But as it is, the interpreter is under no such compulsion. He is perfectly free to interpret both passages in the most obvious and natural way. And when so interpreted, these passages add something to the probability (already established on the basis of more general considerations) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained a chapter corresponding to Mt. ii. That no other and clearer allusions to a narrative of the birth of Jesus in the Gospel according to the Hebrews have been discovered may indicate that those writers who used the gospel found no birth narrative there; but it may also indicate simply that the birth narrative of this gospel was so much like that of the canonical Matthew that references to it would have been superfluous.¹²⁶ It is the absence of such a narrative which would have evoked comment.¹²⁷

¹²³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 88ff.

¹²⁴ In "in quo", middle of the citation.

¹²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 280: "Bei dieser Gelegenheit, das ist der Sinn, muss die Aufmerksamkeit besonders darauf gerichtet werden, dass der Verfasser des Matth.-Evangeliums nie nach der Septuaginta, sondern stets nach dem hebräischen Text citiert." This interpretation is more natural than that of Ropes.

¹²⁶ See Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 686.

¹²⁷ Cf. pp. 562ff. above. The suggestion of A. Meyer, in Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, p. 15, that Mt. ii may have stood in the Gospel according to the Hebrews without any account of the virgin

Two objections may be urged against the conclusion that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained a narrative corresponding to Mt. i-ii.

In the first place, a stichometric list of canonical, disputed and apocryphal books attached to the *Chronography* of Nicephorus¹²⁸ makes the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with 2200 stichoi, considerably shorter than the canonical Matthew, with 2500 stichoi.¹²⁹ But the extant fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews appear to be longer rather than shorter than the corresponding passages of Matthew. Therefore the difference in length may best be accounted for by the absence of a narrative of the birth in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The argument is plausible, but should not be allowed to contradict the more definite evidence which has been adduced above. The figure 2200 may be incorrect,¹³⁰ or the greater length of Matthew may be accounted for by omissions in the Gospel according to the Hebrews other than the omission of the birth narrative.¹³¹

In the second place, the extant fragments of the gospel are thought to be contradictory to the virgin birth, which therefore, it is said, was probably not narrated in the same book. So far as the account of the baptism is concerned, the argument has little weight. The words of the Spirit: "Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum", do not necessarily mean that Jesus has not become the Son of the

birth is not impossible. But in view of what has been said above (pp. 562ff.), it is unlikely.

¹²⁸ For introduction and text, see Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 295ff.

¹²⁹ Mark 2000 stichoi, John 2300, Luke 2600.

¹³⁰ So Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 717, who appeals to other ancient errors in the figures of the stichometry.

¹³¹ Long stretches in the central part of Matthew are unrepresented in the extant fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. See Zahn, *loc. cit.* It has been observed above (p. 562) that a great difference in the middle would affect the Matthaean appearance of the gospel less unfavorably than a much smaller difference at the beginning.

Spirit before the baptism. The fragment mentioned above, in which Jesus speaks of the Spirit as "my Mother" deserves somewhat closer attention; for in Mt. i. 18-25 the Spirit takes the place not of the mother but of the father. But the designation of the Spirit as the Mother contradicts not the canonical narratives themselves but a crassly materialistic interpretation of them. The feminine gender of the Semitic word for Spirit,¹³² which has given rise to the "my Mother"¹³³ of the fragment, was in the original Aramaic written or oral sources of Matthew and Luke¹³⁴ simply an additional safeguard of the lofty spiritual meaning of the birth story. "In divinitate nullus est sexus."¹³⁵

The preceding argument, though it does not make the presence of an account of the virgin birth in the Gospel according to the Hebrews altogether certain, at least makes it probable. The importance of this conclusion depends partly upon the antiquity and value that is to be attributed to the gospel itself. If the gospel was written in the first century, as Harnack supposes, then its testimony becomes exceedingly valuable. But even if the dating of Zahn, after 135 A. D., is to be adopted, even then the gospel provides a valuable supplement of other evidence. The special import-

¹³² Hebrew רִיחָ .

¹³³ ἡ μήτηρ μου.

¹³⁴ Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x., 1912, pp. 1-38, 212-277.

¹³⁵ Jerome, *comm. in Isaiam* iv. 11 (iv. 485f): "Nemo autem in hac parte scandalizari debet, quod dicatur apud Hebraeos spiritus genere feminino, cum nostra lingua appelletur genere masculino, et Graeco sermone neutro. In divinitate enim nullus est sexus. Et ideo in tribus principalibus linguis, quibus titulus Dominicae scriptus est passionis, tribus generibus appellatur, ut sciamur nullius esse generis quod diversum est." Cf. *epist. ad Damasum de Seraphim et calculo* 17 (i. 60): "...quando de superioribus disputatur, et masculinum aliquid, seu femininum ponitur, non tam sexum significari, quam idioma sonare linguae." Origen, in *Ioh.* (ed. Preuschen iv. p. 67), compares the figurative use of the term "mother" in Jesus' words about him who does the will of God. All three passages are cited by Nicholson, *op. cit.*, pp. 80f. (Nicholson's reference seems to be wrong in the case of the last passage).

ance of the testimony of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to the virgin birth of Christ is that it is a testimony by Jewish Christians. If not only Gentile Christians but also Jewish Christians accepted the virgin birth before the close of the first century, then the legendary or mythical explanation of the origin of the idea becomes very difficult.

It is now time to sum up the results of the preceding discussion concerning the Jewish Christian denials of the virgin birth,

The virgin birth was denied, in the first place, by the Gnostic Ebionites described by Epiphanius; but the character of this sect is such as to raise a very unfavorable presumption with regard to its historical traditions. These Gnostics are as far removed as possible from all that is known of primitive Jewish Christianity. It is therefore exceedingly unlikely that they were united with Jesus or with His first disciples by a tradition which has elsewhere been lost. At any rate, the only gospel which they are known to have used was a worthless compilation, which exhibits the most unscrupulous dogmatic alterations of the canonical material.¹³⁶

The virgin birth was perhaps denied also by certain Pharisaic Ebionites, who, aside from their humanitarian views about Jesus, differed from the Catholic Church merely by a strict insistence upon the Jewish law: though the evidence for the existence of such a sect has been greatly exaggerated both as to quantity and as to quality. At any rate, their denial of the virgin birth is not difficult to explain. They probably belonged to the stricter party of the Jewish Christians, who insisted upon the observance of the law by Gentiles as well as by Jews.¹³⁷ They were more Jews than Christians, and to the orthodox Jew the virgin birth was an abomination.¹³⁸ It seemed out of harmony with his pride in the marriage relation and the begetting of children.

¹³⁶ Cf. Zahn, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 56.

¹³⁷ See below, footnote 142.

¹³⁸ Cf. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i⁴, 1902, pp. 210, 214.

It might seem to him to make void God's promise of a prince of David's line. It contradicted the exaggerated transcendentalism of his idea of God, and seemed to make Jehovah no better than Zeus.

These Jewish Christian denials of the virgin birth are more than neutralized by the Jewish Christian affirmation of it.

In the first place, the affirmation can be traced at least as far back as the denial.^{138a} The denial appears for the first time in Justin Martyr, and it appears in such a way as to suggest that at that time it was by no means formidable. In the eyes of the non-Christian Jews, at any rate, it did not loom very large. Until corrected by Justin, the Jews were apparently unaware that the Messiahship of Jesus could be accepted apart from the virgin birth. At the beginning of the second century, Ignatius, when arguing against Judaizers, apparently felt no need of correcting their view of the birth of Jesus. Let it not be said that this is due to indifference on the part of Ignatius, or to the fact that the virgin birth had not yet become firmly established as a doctrine of the Church. Ignatius hardly yields to any later writer in the place he assigns to the virginity of Mary—it is for him one of the three great mysteries whose long-deferred revelation marks a new epoch in the history of the world. It is true, the argument from silence should be used with caution. But the silence of Ignatius about Jewish Christian denial of the virgin birth is at least as significant as Justin's silence¹³⁹ about Jewish Christian acceptance of it.¹⁴⁰ Furthermore, the Gospel according to the Hebrews is probably

^{138a} Even leaving out of account the New Testament evidence.

¹³⁹ It has already been shown that it is only apparent silence.

¹⁴⁰ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part ii, vol. i. pp. 373ff., supposed that the form of error which Ignatius is combatting throughout the epistles is Gnostic Judaism. Harnack, in *Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. iii., 1886, pp. 175ff., supposes that separate heresies—non-Jewish docetism and ordinary Judaizing—are combatted. If Harnack is correct, only a comparatively small portion of the epistles is occupied with Judaistic error, and the argument just stated becomes, perhaps, somewhat weaker.

a direct witness to Jewish Christian belief in the virgin birth, from a time prior to that of Justin.¹⁴¹

In the second place, the character of those Jewish Christians who accepted the virgin birth raises a presumption in favor of their affirmation. Ritschl pointed out the close similarity between the views of the Nazarenes of Jerome and the views of the original apostles. Like the original apostles, the Nazarenes for their own part continued the observance of the Jewish law; but, again like the apostles, they recognized the freedom of the Gentile Christians and approved the work of Paul. The stricter Ebionites, on the contrary, who sought to force the observance of the law upon the Gentile converts^{141a} and regarded Paul as an apostate, were the spiritual successors not of the apostles who had stood nearest to Jesus, but of the Judaizing "false brethren, privily brought in".¹⁴² In general, these Naza-

¹⁴¹ It is not improbable that very early (and probably Jewish Christian) testimonies to the virgin birth are to be found (1) in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, (2) in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and (3) in the newly discovered *Odes of Solomon*. The passage in the *Ascension of Isaiah* which narrates the virgin birth is placed by Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, 1900, pp. xxiiff., xxviii, xlivf., 77, at the close of the first century. Cf. however Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. pp. 574ff. For the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see Warfield, *The Apologetic Value of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, in *Presbyterian Review*, i., 1880, pp. 57-84. Warfield regarded this work as a document of the "Nazarene" Christianity of the early part of the second century. His complaint that the book is unduly neglected by defenders of traditional views is true to-day as well as thirty years ago, and true with regard to the virgin birth as well as with regard to the New Testament canon. Indeed, the reason why the three works just named are not discussed in the present article is not that they do not afford highly important testimony to the virgin birth, but rather that the questions concerning them are so intricate and the diversity of solutions so great, that it would transcend the limits of the present article to attempt anything like a precise estimation of their importance. They would have to be saved for separate discussion.

^{141a} For the distinction between the milder and the stricter party of Jewish Christians, see Justin Martyr, *dial.* 47.

¹⁴² Ritschl, *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*,² pp. 152ff. No doubt the evidence will not warrant the definite division of Jewish Christianity into two parties, the milder party accepting the virgin birth and the stricter party denying it (see Nitzsch, *Dogmengeschichte*, pp. 42f.).

renes, living in seclusion in the East and using their own ancient gospel, produce an impression of conservatism and antiquity in marked contrast to the Ebionites of Epiphanius, with their doctrinal innovations and their worthless gospel.

The foregoing discussion of the Nazarenes and Ebionites has followed for the most part the main trend of recent opinion as influenced chiefly by Zahn, Handmann, and Harnack. Despite important differences in detail, a large measure of unanimity had been attained. But in 1911 the whole question was re-opened by the elaborate work of Schmidtke on the Jewish Christian gospels.¹⁴³ One thing is clear—Schmidtke cannot be ignored. His investigation, which is exceedingly thorough and is based partly upon new materials, has resulted in an entirely new reconstruction of the Jewish Christian gospels and of their readers. A critical examination of Schmidtke's arguments is the first duty of subsequent investigation in this field. That duty has not yet been performed, and it will probably not be satisfactorily performed for a number of years. For it will involve nothing less than a thorough reconsideration of all the complicated questions connected with schismatic Jewish Christianity. In the present article, all that can be attempted is (1) a brief exposition of Schmidtke's view, and (2) some

But at any rate there is no evidence that any who held the milder view about the law, from the time of Justin to that of Jerome, denied the virgin birth; though a rather ambiguous passage in Eusebius (*hist. eccl.* iii. 27) seems to mean that those who accepted the virgin birth were of the stricter way of thinking. The passage, when taken in connection with the evidence from Jerome, may indicate merely that not only the milder Jewish Christians but also some of the stricter ones accepted the virgin birth. At any rate, it is natural to expect that the stricter Ebionites in general would deny the virgin birth while the milder party would accept it. For the strict view of the continued validity of the ceremonial law would naturally be joined to a low view of the epoch-making significance of Jesus' coming. On the other hand, to abrogate the law of Moses something more than a human Messiah was required. Which view was historically correct—the view which made Christianity a mere continuation of Judaism, or the view which made the birth of Jesus an entirely new beginning in the religious history of the world?

¹⁴³ Mentioned frequently above.

estimate of its bearing upon the question of the virgin birth.

The results of Schmidtke's investigation may be summarized briefly as follows.

At an early date, the Jewish Christians in Beroea in Syria, who had before simply formed part of the mixed church of that city, drifted apart, owing to the force of circumstances, from the Gentile Christians, and formed a separate community. These Jewish Christians of Beroea came to be designated as Nazarenes. The statement of Jerome that the Nazarenes were spread abroad through the synagogues of the East is entirely valueless. There never were Nazarenes outside of Beroea. The Nazarenes had formed part of the Catholic Church, and even after their separation differed from the Gentile Christians in little more than in their own devotion to Jewish customs. For example, they recognized the work of Paul with enthusiasm, and accepted the doctrine of the virgin birth. At some time after the writing of Ignatius' epistle to the Smyrnaeans, but before 150 A. D., the Nazarenes of Beroea translated the Greek Gospel of Matthew into their own language, the Aramaic. It was not a perfectly literal translation, being rather somewhat like a targum. It displayed incidental acquaintance with Luke and John as well as with Matthew. But it did not differ from Matthew sufficiently to be regarded as a separate book. There is every reason to suppose, for example, that it contained Mt. i-ii. This Aramaic Matthew of Beroea, though it was really a translation of the canonical Greek Matthew, came to be regarded as the original from which the Greek Matthew had been translated, and thus gave rise to the tradition of the "Hebrew" original of Matthew, which is attested by Papias in the middle of the second century and played a large rôle in Irenaeus and subsequent writers. The Nazarene gospel was used by Hegesippus (about 180 A. D.), but was unknown except by hearsay to other writers until Eusebius. Eusebius had not seen the gospel when he wrote the *Church History*, but secured a copy before the appearance of his *Theophany*. He regarded the gospel as the

original of Matthew. His copy was added to the library at Caesarea, where it remained in the time of Jerome. But the author who brought the gospel into prominence was Apollinaris of Laodicea. To him we owe the fragments which have been preserved by Jerome, and also those which have been preserved on the margin of certain Gospel manuscripts which are descended from an edition of the Gospels which may be called the "Zion edition". This Nazarene gospel was never regarded by anyone who was really familiar with its contents as a work distinct from the canonical Matthew, but was regarded as the original from which the canonical Gospel had been translated. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

The Ebionites mentioned by Irenaeus and later writers were a sect quite distinct from the Nazarenes. They were characterized by a denial of the virgin birth, though the name "Ebionites" was wrongly applied by Origen and Eusebius also to a sect that accepted the virgin birth. When Epiphanius wrote the first draught of his section on the Ebionites, he had no first-hand knowledge of them whatever. His description of the sect is vitiated by a confusion of the Ebionites with the Elkesaites, and by a wholesale employment of the material of the Clementine writings as the source of information about the Ebionites. All that he says about the Gnostic character of the Ebionites is based simply upon these groundless combinations. There never were any Gnostic Ebionites. But what Epiphanius says about the vegetarian principles of the Ebionites is correct. After writing the first draught of his chapter, Epiphanius received first-hand information about contemporary Ebionites on the island of Cyprus, and became acquainted with their gospel. This later and correct information was simply added to the original draught of Epiphanius' work, and the result is the confused account which we have before us. The Ebionite gospel from which Epiphanius gives extracts is to be identified not with the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles,¹⁴⁴ but with

¹⁴⁴ Cf. above, pp. 555f.

the Ebionite gospel which is mentioned by Irenaeus as a Gospel of Matthew and is also mentioned and cited by Origen and others under the title "Gospel according to the Hebrews". The earliest trace of its use is in Hegesippus. To this Gospel according to the Hebrews are to be assigned the fragments in Epiphanius which have usually been assigned to the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles,¹⁴⁵ and also such fragments as the fragment in Origen which mentions the Holy Spirit as Mother of Jesus. This Greek Gospel according to the Hebrews has absolutely nothing to do with the Aramaic Matthew of the Nazarenes. The two were kept quite separate by the early writers. Eusebius says of Hegesippus that he cited from the Gospel according to the Hebrews *and* from the Syriac (Gospel).¹⁴⁶ Here the two are placed clearly side by side. The identification of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with the Aramaic Matthew of the Nazarenes is due altogether to the combined stupidity and deceitfulness of Jerome. Despite what he says about his Greek and Latin translation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and about his opportunity of transcribing the Nazarene gospel, he was not really familiar with either one. He saw the Aramaic Matthew in the library at Caesarea, but on account of his ignorance of Aramaic was unable to use it to any great extent. His knowledge of the Gospel according to the Hebrews was derived from Origen; his knowledge of the Aramaic Matthew from Apollinaris of Laodicea. Since he was ignorant of both gospels, it was possible for him to confuse them. He interpreted "according to the Hebrews" in the title of the Gospel according to the Hebrews erroneously in a linguistic sense, and so was led to identify this gospel with the Aramaic gospel of the Nazarenes. His designations of the Aramaic gospel and of the Gospel according to the Hebrews vary according to his

¹⁴⁵ Schmidtke removes, however, from the list of these fragments the one which refers to the abrogation of sacrifices. See above, footnote 83.

¹⁴⁶ *Hist. eccl.* iv. 22, 8: ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τίθησιν. Cf. however Nestle, *Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament*, 2te Aufl., pp. 77f.

sources of information and according to the exigencies of the occasion. In the *Commentary on Matthew*, for example, he could not well designate a gospel which he referred to only occasionally as the original of Matthew, for if the gospel was the original of Matthew it was absurd for him not to refer to it oftener. He could not refer to it oftener because his knowledge of it was really limited to the citations made by Apollinaris.

Even such a brief summary may suffice to exhibit the revolutionary character of Schmidtke's treatment of the Jewish Christian gospels. The theory cannot here be examined critically. But such examination can be omitted with the better conscience because the importance of Schmidtke's investigation for the question of the historicity of the virgin birth is not so great as might be supposed. If Schmidtke's theory should prove to be correct, the second-century testimony to the virgin birth would not be weakened.

It is true, if Schmidtke is right, the Nazarenes, who accepted the virgin birth, can no longer be regarded as a wide-spread sect, but become a local community at Beroea in Syria. It is true that the more orthodox "Ebionites" whom Origen and Eusebius represent as accepting the virgin birth disappear from the pages of history.¹⁴⁷ It is true that the Nazarene gospel, which contained an account of the virgin birth, can no longer be regarded as embodying independent tradition, but becomes a mere translation of Matthew with some employment of the other canonical Gospels. It is true that the Ebionites of Epiphanius, who denied the virgin birth, are cleared of the charge of unhistorical Gnostic speculations. It is true that the Gospel according to the Hebrews mentioned by Hegesippus and other early writers can no longer be regarded as containing an account of the virgin

¹⁴⁷ Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, p. 241, suggests that the more orthodox of Origen's two classes of "Ebionites" is due simply to a false application of the name "Ebionite" to the Gnostic Jewish Christians, who, according to Schmidtke, accepted the virgin birth. It is the same confusion which Schmidtke sees in the connection which Epiphanius sets up between Elxai and the Ebionites. The suggestion is exceedingly bold.

birth. These features of Schmidtke's theory may appear to weaken the testimony to the virgin birth and enhance the value of the Jewish Christian denials of it. But other features of the theory point just as strongly in the opposite direction. In the first place, though the Nazarenes shrink to the proportions of a local community, their primitive appearance remains. And they accepted the virgin birth. It was the mere chance of their survival as a separate sect which made them peculiar. Other Jewish Christians of similarly primitive character may be held simply to have been merged in the Catholic Church. In the second place, the Nazarene gospel, if it ceases to be a depository of independent tradition, becomes a valuable witness to the early acceptance of the Gospel of Matthew on the part of Jewish Christians. And the Gospel of Matthew contained an account of the virgin birth. In the third place, if the Ebionites, who denied the virgin birth, cease to be Gnostic, they cannot for that reason lay claim to special primitiveness. Their language, for instance, was Greek not Aramaic. Finally, if by Schmidtke's theory the Gospel according to the Hebrews is shown to have contained no account of the virgin birth, it is also shown to be utterly valueless. The only gospel of these Jewish Christians who denied the virgin birth, the only Jewish Christian gospel which did not contain an account of the virgin birth, was a worthless Greek compilation based upon our canonical Gospels, a compilation which displays incidental dependence even upon those infancy sections which it omitted. The use of this gospel by Hegesippus and the mention of it by Irenaeus form simply further testimony to the early authority of the fourfold Gospel canon. And the employment of this gospel, and of this gospel only, by the Ebionites proves how absolutely destitute they were of genuine historical tradition, except such as was embodied in the canonical Gospels. Whatever the cause of their denial of the virgin birth, such denial was not based upon primitive tradition coming down from the time of Jesus. No sect whose sole gospel was the one which Epi-

phanus quotes in his chapter on the Ebionites has the slightest claim to be regarded as standing in any direct and peculiar relation to the primitive Jewish church.

One fact deserves to be kept constantly in mind in the whole discussion. Jewish Christianity was not confined to the schismatic Jewish Christians included in lists of heresies. It has been proved above that even of the heretical Jewish Christians mentioned by Origen and others some accepted the virgin birth. But this whole discussion has left wholly out of account the great numbers of Jewish Christians who simply became merged in the Catholic Church.¹⁴⁸ And everything points to the hypothesis that these, and not the schismatics of whatever opinion, were in possession of the most primitive historical tradition with regard to the life of Jesus.

The results of the foregoing investigation of the second-century testimony to the virgin birth may be summed up in two propositions:—

1. A firm and well-formulated belief in the virgin birth extends back to the early years of the second century.

2. The denials of the virgin birth which appeared after the beginning of the second century were based upon philosophical or dogmatic prepossession more probably than upon genuine historical tradition.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

¹⁴⁸ See Schmidtke, *op. cit.*, pp. 247ff., especially pp. 247f., Anm. 4.

THE DOCUMENTS OF THE EXODUS, CONTEMPORARY, ORIGINAL, AND WRITTEN.

By documents of the Exodus are meant the historical documents relating to the Exodus and the Conquest, extending from Exodus 1 : 1 to Judges 3 : 11—the death of the youngest eye-witness to the events. These documents are, from one point of view, the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges. From another point of view they are J E D P, and from a third point of view they are the documents, written or oral, early or late, original or digested, used by J E D and P, so far as they may be distinguished as wholes; oracles, registers, censuses, inventories, regulations, lists of persons, materials, offerings, etc. This paper is a broad criticism of these documents in the light of what is now known of the registerial and archival practice of the times. Its conclusions do not dispute the existence of J E D and P. They do, however, tend to prove and to the author do seem to show beyond dispute that, if there was an Exodus at all, however small, the great bulk of the books from Exodus to Joshua, as they stand, are in the main wholly natural as contemporary documents and incredible as composed at any later times, or transmitted in any other way than that recorded in the documents themselves.

The historical criticism of the documents of this period has, as is well known, now for a long time revolved around two main hypotheses, (1) the analysis into J E D P, with the contributions of their various redactors, and (2) the hypothesis of accumulative composition of the present books by the union, first of J with E, then of J E with D, and finally J E D with P. According to the received version of this hypothesis J D E and P are separate collections of scattered documents, oral or written, gathered by an evolutionary process extending over centuries. According to Chapman (*Introd.* pp. 180-6), J and E evolved separately in Judah and

Ephraim until the end of the northern kingdom, then J and E united. D was added to both in the 7th century, and P added to J E D about 444 B. C. According to Sellin, J was formed about 1000 B. C., E in its first form about 800, J E about 722-699, J E D in the 6th century, and J E D P in the 5th century. The picture background of this received version is a process of folk-literature evolution, based largely on ideas connoted by the word "tradition" and even "legend", "myth", or "oral tradition". In the main it is the image of wild times and a wild people making a slow progress in civilization all over again for themselves—of tales told around the camp-fire or the well-mouth, of the accidental accumulation of a sort of common law by memory of oral decisions of judges, of the treasuring of local stories of religious experience at local shrines, of popular songs, of land transfers by tribal ceremony without writing, of boundary stones without inscriptions, serving as mnemonic for ancient events.

For the most part the literary remains of this period are still assumed to be oral literature. Of late, it is true, it is customary to picture "some" written documents at least but for the most part even these are still pictured as a setting down of laws, tales, etc., already current orally for some time. Mr. Chapman in his capital brief statement of the whole case in his *Introduction to the Pentateuch* (1911), in the "Cambridge Bible for Schools," says that the Torah was "at first handed down orally", speaks of the "steps from oral to written Torah", and says that "the message of the prophets was first conveyed orally", and that "written prophecy follows after oral prophecy". This is quite in the spirit of Carpenter-Harford which speaks of J and E as "pentads . . . for easy recollection . . . preserved by oral repetition or possibly in some cases by being engraved on wood, stone, or metal", preserved "by hearsay", "presumably oral sources" (of P), "oral priestly directions", "formed first . . . written down later", "accepted custom", "date after the disruption for . . . written form".

Nevertheless the picture has been a good deal altered from that of the time when the Hebrews could be imagined as illiterate. The theory of exclusive oral tradition in the old sense right up to the formation of J and E, or say 1000 B. C., may fairly be called dead. Chapman e. g. agrees that "some historical and legal records" have been preserved even in J and E, although he thinks it doubtful when they were first committed to writing and finds proof that the writers "are separated by some interval of time from the events which they record". He says with fairness (p. 309) that the modern critics do not doubt that Moses could have written a book, but the question is "whether the internal evidence supplied by the existing Pentateuch justifies the assumption that he did write it". Sellin, who stands for what may be called the extreme written-document wing of the "scattered document" accumulative theory, accepts many written documents, some contemporary and even Mosaic, and remarks that "Even to have raised the question as to whether a Moses living about 1300 B. C. could write seems to us in these days quite without rhyme or reason".

The *textus receptus* of the current hypotheses accepts thus a reluctant minimum of written sources amid great masses of oral traditions for the period of the Exodus, and this requires for the later history of the books the picture of diligent folk-lore-gatherers, of zealous prophets moulding the results and adding to the laws, of clever priests selecting and adapting law and ritual to modern requirements and ingeniously giving it the weight of Mosaic authority.

Now the point of this paper is not to attack "oral tradition", documentary analysis, gradual accumulation, editing and revising by distinguishable hands, priestly forgery and tendency, or any of the other elements of the current hypotheses in themselves. As in the question of Mosaic writing it is a question not of whether these things are but whether they apply to these documents. Folk literature, Tatian's Diatessaron, the medieval chroniclers, the Arabic historians,

and the other analogies commonly used, are acknowledged literary facts well suited to illustrate the alleged process of literary composition of the Exodus documents, but they illustrate no universal method of literary composition and other literary works exhibit other methods and processes. These customary examples all point to the unification and redaction of scattered materials and the uniting again of separately formed collections, but there are plenty of good examples of the contrary method, of the expansion and redaction of a single considerable series of documents. Oral tradition again e. g., is a fact which undoubtedly plays some part in these documents, although oral tradition as pictured by some writers on the Octateuch or even in the received version of the hypothesis perhaps never existed anywhere on sea or land; but the question is one of fact. Again we know quite well how cleverly monks of the Middle Ages forged charters and customs for the pious sake of their monasteries, and if priests of the 5th century B. C. could give to their account so archaic a character, they are simply cleverer (almost preternaturally cleverer however) than the medieval forgers. But it is a question of fact.

Nor again is it the purpose of this paper even to dispute the division, sequence of accumulation, or even the dates of the later matter. In trying to get at the heart of the matter one need not deny (1) the analysis into J E D P, (2) the successive introduction of J E D and P into the work together with minor additions of various revisers and editors, (3) nor even the dating of these additions at several points after 1000 B. C. The bottom difference is simply between scattered sources joining like roots of a tree by successive gatherings into a tree trunk or on the other hand a single source like a tree trunk putting out branches and leaves, and this, like the question of the literacy of Moses, is one of fact not of mere possibility in either direction. This is the real question.

So much of the best recent scholarship has been bent on the problem under the point of view of scattered documents

and long gradual accumulation of a folk-lore evolution that it is asking a good deal to ask much better Biblical scholars than the writer to review the whole mass of their painstaking material in view of what is to them, perhaps, a discredited theory of continuous written documents. Yet this is what we here venture to ask and on the ground that the progress of the book-sciences has been such in recent years as to present a very different visual image of the circumstances of the times in which these books were formed in the matter of composition, record, preservation, and transmission of documents, from that of the old folklore picture.

This visualization too lies at the bottom of the whole matter. Mr. Chapman rightly emphasizes that criticism works "on internal evidence from the existing books" and the "evidence of the books themselves", but this examination is in the presence of a very definite background or environment—the actual bibliographical circumstances of the place and time. This picture background is at bottom the norm, the real critical factor. Moreover, the critics having impeached and rejected the evidence of the books themselves regarding the actual literary circumstances of the composition of these documents, we must perforce start from the external.

To begin with, it is a plain principle of criticism that, if externals do not forbid, *prima facie* evidence is for the truth of the relations of the documents themselves, and, as we have seen, modern critics no longer deny that external circumstances allow at least of some writing. It may be doubted if modern critics realize the far-reaching bearings of even this simple recognition, without qualification, of the fact that writing was common in the time and region of Moses. This single fact makes, to begin with, the methods of record, as given, natural enough and rehabilitates the rights of the hypothesis of original written composition. As the general external circumstances of the time in the matter of the methods of record do not contradict this in any way, the burden of proof is thus put upon those who deny the

straightforward account of the documents themselves. But this is only the faint beginning of the consequences of recognizing literacy; it is the details which seem to show constructively that the documents would have been composed as alleged by themselves at that time, could not possibly, as to the bulk of them, have been composed as alleged by the contrary current theory, and could only have been cast in this form in 444, 700, or 900 B. C. by preternatural forgery.

The general method of composition as given by the documents themselves is familiar enough. Much the largest fraction of Exodus-Numbers is spoken by Jehovah to Moses or Aaron, proclaimed to elders or people, written down and put in the ark. Besides this there is a narrative of daily events of some bulk and many miscellaneous documents; lists of offerings, of booty, of materials for public works, censuses, poems, genealogies, and the like, ostensibly in chronological order. Then Moses epitomizes the whole in Deuteronomy and writes on a roll deposited by the side of the ark. Joshua continued the book of Moses and he, or some one else, continued the story down to his death, making use of a topographical survey, a book of Jasher and presumably other written works. Some one, perhaps Phinehas, continued the narrative after the death of Joshua and Eleazar for a little time at least. This account is simple, natural, straightforward, self-coherent and wholly in accord with what is known of the alleged times and circumstances. What is there in it to drive critics to elaborate theories of "tradition", scattered sources, oral tradition and the like? The account does not in itself deny either of the main hypotheses of composite authorship or accumulation of material.

As for composite authorship the matter has been needlessly complicated with the question of Mosaic authorship. In reconstructing the picture, therefore, it should not be forgotten that the evidence of the books themselves is against exclusive Mosaic authorship and especially in the matter of style. Moses would not trust himself even to repeat the words of the Lord, save for substance of doctrine, and

relied on Aaron to give the ideas fit expression. Moreover it is quite clear from the documents that their authors at least held to composite authorship. Aaron himself received many of the revelations recorded. Miriam also claimed to have received oracular revelations and is credited with the authorship of a short poem. Joshua appears to have acted as amanuensis on the Mount and in the tent of meeting. After the death of Aaron, Moses must either have written in his own style or had some one else in Aaron's place. This might have been Eleazar, who certainly helped in recording the divine words and helped in taking the census. Ithamar apparently wrote the inventory of tabernacle material. Moses himself is credited with the itinerary in Numbers and the book of Deuteronomy as well as sundry poems. Contemporary authorship is not, therefore, necessarily Mosaic, nor does substantial Mosaic authorship necessarily imply one literary style. If the record is correct, criticism should be able to detect at least five styles and four authors before the death of Eleazar and the end of the book of Joshua. It is not of course intended to assert that these authors are J E D P or anything else, but only that differences of style and composite authorship are asserted or implied by the documents themselves and a true analysis into several authorships would strengthen the authenticity of the documents.

As for accumulation almost every old document transmitted by copying takes on some variations. Even textual criticism reveals that an undoubtedly unitary document may in its transmission take on traces of every period through which it passes and that without very substantially altering form or contents of the document. Very large changes even may, on the one hand, mean nothing more than glossing, and, on the other hand, even if the additions and changes are not gloss-insertions but voluntary additions, and even if the later matter outpaces the original ten to one, all this may still be without substantially altering even the words of the original document or documents. It is equally not intended

to say here that J E D P and the various R's are such glosses or voluntary additions, but only to note that, however great the additions may be, they do not therefore contradict the method of composition described in the documents, or the unitary written character of the original, or the substantial process of written cumulation described in the documents.

Why then do critics still discard this simple, natural, and recorded method of composition for one complex and hypothetical at best? At bottom this is a matter of just conservatism. The older critics gave up the recorded account purely on the illiteracy idea—a mistaken conception of the literary conditions of the times. The succeeding critics, sparingly admitting potential literacy, denied the possibility of enough progress to justify the language even, and later, granting a modernizing of archaic language, they still denied enough progress of literary composition to justify the present form. The latest critics, following the analysis of the older ones and verifying their observations as to later additions, are naturally less responsive to the growing evidence for the wealth of literary surrounding at the Exodus, than those who come to it with fresh minds, and they are not disposed to give up their positions except for positive evidence. It is a reasonable conservatism, but at bottom pure conservatism.

These conservative radical critics say therefore to the radical conservative critics that while certain passages may be regarded as editorial additions, others cannot (Chapman pp. 42-9), that the narratives were composed in Palestine, that all sources (J E D P) contain evidence of being of later composition than Moses, and especially that the laws include three separate codes which belong to different periods in the history of Israel. These answers cannot be dismissed off-hand on the ground of natural and editorial additions. The two latter arguments might be accounted for by such additions but the first expressly denies that all can be. Chapman's passages do not look to the writer very strong, but it is easy to realize that they do seem strong to those working

with a certain conventional background of literary circumstance—the usual folk-literature, Tatian, etc., atmosphere. How in the world, they may fairly say, can duplicate narratives, the local coloring of J and E, and so many evidences of later dates in all the sources, possibly be explained under these circumstances?

They cannot; but the trouble is with the alleged circumstances which (speaking with all diffidence) are not so. Take to begin with the matter of the laws and prophecies on the received hypotheses. "The message of the prophets was at first conveyed orally", "written prophecy follows after oral prophecy". So of the Torah, "at first handed down orally the decisions of priests would in the course of time be committed to writing" (Chapman). The picture background of law-formation is of a judge at the gate rendering extempore decisions out of his own practical judgment and without court-records. The picture of the prophets is one of men preaching simply moral truth to a deaf people and, after long preaching in vain, at last writing down their message. Now as a matter of fact from say 1400-1100 B. C. this is bibliographically all wrong! Laws were not formed nor was the office of prophet exercised in this way anywhere and least of all in Egypt. Certainly this was not the case among the peoples through whom the Israelites went,—the Midianites with their priest-kings or the Moabites worshipping Chemosh. Nor was it the case among the Amorites and Hittites in Palestine when they entered. If things had been as here pictured it would have been a unique case of atavism, of reversion to conditions which had not existed where they came from, where they went to, and where they went through for hundreds or even thousands of years.

The account of the documents themselves is much more in keeping with the times—quite so indeed. To begin with, the earliest prophets mentioned, the seventy elders, are all "writers" (officers); and when, too, judges are first instituted in the gates, "writers" or scribes are furnished with

them. This was normal to the times. Laws were written and court decisions recorded, and prophecy, if proclaimed orally, was commonly written either beforehand or after utterance all over the world. The Egyptian judges judged with the forty rolls of the law before them (c. 1400 B. C.) and records of some important cases are preserved (e. g. the famous conspiracy under Rameses III and the cases of the tomb robbers). Thoth, the god of law, is "the lord of laws, whose words are *written*" (*Book of the Dead*, ch. 182-3); it is he "who makes the *writing* speak" in connection with oracles (Breasted ii. p. 64). If King Harmhab wished to make laws for the reform of law procedure, his scribe "seized palette and roll; he put it into writing". In the directions to a vizier it is required that in case of trial everything shall be recorded (Breasted ii. p. 276).

The fallacy of oral prophecy and Torah is however best seen at the point where the two unite—in the universal giving of law and important decisions by oracle. What Jastrow says of Babylonia is true for Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and almost beyond peradventure Midian, Moab (very soon after at least), and in short the whole world before J E was formed. "A legal decision", says Jastrow, (*Rel. Belief* p. 275), "was an oracle or omen . . . Tôrah has its equivalent in the Babylonian *têrtu* . . . omen". "The ultimate source of all law being the deity himself", "Legal decisions were accordingly given through the representatives and servitors of the gods—the kings, in the earlier ages, and later the priests". Among priests Jastrow obviously includes the Babylonian *abkallu*, the Egyptian prophet, the Spartan Pythian, etc., all of whom may be differentiated from the priests proper at times.

The priest-king or his aids, of whatever name, getting the will of God through an oracle, is perhaps the central fact of all the earlier civilizations. In the matter of laws Khammurabi on his stela shows the Sun God dictating the laws to him; his predecessor in the making of codes, Ur Engur got his laws too from the Sun God, Gudea had his

from Nina and Ningirsu, and earlier still Urukagina, promulgating his reform laws, causes, as he says, the word of Ningirsu to dwell in the land and makes a covenant with Ningirsu to keep his laws. Minos got his laws direct by oracle, Solon submitted his to an oracle for approval. When a Greek state made a law or code, it was sent to Delphi for approval or perhaps for composition. The priest-kings, whether Sumerian, Syrian, Hittite, Cypriote, or Egyptian, themselves approached the god to get the oracle, or later, like the Pharaohs, "had a priesthood specially charged to inform them of the will of the gods" (Maspero, *New Light*, p. 273). This process was in important cases, and perhaps at times in all cases, extended to trials. In the Code of Khammurabi (9, 23, 106, 107, 126, 240, 266, 281) and in the correspondence of the Hittite King, Hattusil (c. 1400 B.C. *DOG* 1907, no. 35, p. 24), cases are brought "before the god" as in Egypt on the stela of Menkheperre, the stela of Sheshonk, and the Dakal stela they are before Amon or Sutekh, and as the Hebrews bring them before Jehovah. This practice was common to all nations and survived in medieval times in the ordeal.

Oracle literature proper as distinguished from omen and magic literature proper was abundant in all countries and in all early times. Extant specimens are numerous. Herodotus e. g. is full of examples of Greek oracles, and collections of these were, we know, made before his time and carried about the country by the boxful by professional fortune-tellers as the tools of their trade. The Egyptian historical inscriptions are full too of the "utterances" ("words") of Amon, Amon Re, Knium, Thoth, "all the gods". Those extant from Babylonia and Egypt are of all sorts; statutes, decisions, blessings, curses, directions for ritual observance, prophetic victory decrees, directions for the setting up of memorial tablets, and every act imaginable. Some of the most famous Egyptian oracles are those connected with Hatshepsut's birth and the expedition which was sent for her to Punt. Thutmose III was chosen by the god and was,

as he says, "sated with the counsels of the gods". There are many extant oracles and references to oracles connected with him and his queen (Breasted ii. pp. 59-300). Records of his campaigns were made by command of Re (Breasted pp. 175, 195). "The king himself commanded to put in writing, according to the statement of the oracle". Two excellent texts are the Punt oracle (p. 116-9) and the Hymn of Victory (p. 263-6), each an "utterance of Amon Re" (cf. "Word of Jehovah"). The whole general attitude is shown where the queen says of Amon (Breasted p. 131) "he it was who led me: I conceived not any works without his doing, he it was who gave the directions".

The ways in which the oracles were rendered are very various—oral speech is often implied or declared. Khammurabi implies that laws were dictated by the voice of Shamash. In the famous Punt oracle "a command was heard from the great throne". Some gesture of the god is however frequently the method, and doubtless this applies also to many oracles which are described as "spoken"—when the priest does the speaking and the god confirms or rejects by gesture. With this should also be classed the very common method of casting lots in the presence of the god—the result being in effect like a nod or other god-gesture. At the choice of Thutmose III, the god in the procession stopped when he reached Thutmose (Breasted ii. p. 60). The nod is common in Egypt, many examples being recorded during the first dynasty (Breasted v. p. 4). When Khonsu gave oracle in Bekhten, whither he had been sent with an attendant "who can write with his fingers" (Breasted iii, p. 194), he both nodded and spoke.

The proclamation of the oracle was of course oral and evidently often it was not committed to writing until after proclamation, but the extant ones were at least written down sometime, and this was true in multitudes of cases. In one interesting case under Sheshonk, what "the Lord of Gods" (Amon) had said was recorded in the "Hall of Writings" (Breasted iv, p. 330). One method, favorite in all countries,

was to write out a decision, a law, or a direction, and have this accepted or rejected by the god by nod or by lot. Sometimes "two tablets of writing were placed before the great god" containing each the contrary of the other and the god chose one or the other. An excellent example of this occurs under Pazozem II (Breasted iv, p. 328) where the matter (a judicial decision) was twice submitted to make sure.

It should be recalled also, to complete the picture of oracle-taking among the Egyptians, that in Egypt the king himself was a god and even the prophets so identified themselves with divinity by inspiration that their words or even the open working by them of the machinery which made a statue nod was regarded as inspired and authoritative divine utterance.

In brief thus everywhere, in all ancient times, and especially at this place and time, the usual way of making laws, inaugurating building operations, wars, expeditions, rules for organized undertakings of all sorts, was for the king-priest, prophet, or priest to secure them from the gods.

Other kinds of documents flourishing at the time of the Exodus were the daily register of the palace, diaries of expeditions, annals, inventories of all sorts in great numbers, censuses, records of cases, decisions, regulations for administration, also in great numbers, and various other documents which have their counterparts among the documentary sources of the Exodus. "After the eighteenth dynasty (1580-1350) the Empire abounds in papyri: letters, bills, receipts, administrative and legal documents, memoranda, numerous literary compositions, scientific treatises, like those in medicine, mathematics, or astronomy, religious documents, and innumerable ostraka . . . bearing receipts, letters, memoranda or literary fragments" (Breasted i, p. 13). This is, of course, the period of the Exodus and as Breasted says elsewhere (p. 1) these are the "merest scrap of the vast mass of written records produced, preserved by accident." Space fails for much detail of this vast wealth of documents, produced and preserved in public or private archives at that time, but some farther account of a few of the classes most

evident among the documents of the Exodus after the oracles and laws, or among the oracles, will make clearer how natural these Exodus documents are under their alleged circumstances, and how unnatural and incredible is any oral transmission of this material which is cast in the ordinary documentary form.

Take e. g. the narrative portions and the liturgical and other directions of routine. For some two thousand years before the Exodus the Egyptians (like the Mesopotamians for most of the time) had had annals, in somewhat bare outline to be sure at first, but apparently growing to enormous proportions in the "palace registers" of Thutmose III (Breasted ii, p. 200) and Harmhab (iii, p. 31), which include minute commissary lists, regulations of sundry sorts and, apparently, many lists of tribute and spoils, narratives of wars and expeditions and the like. This seems to have been the first depository of the day by day record kept by the scribe Thaneni, of the events of the Syrian campaigns of Thutmose III. The abstract of this register, recorded on a leather roll and preserved in the temple archives, omitted the less interesting lists; and the abstract of this roll in turn, made by a priest for engraving on the walls of the temple, was made, it would appear, with a strong priestly bias, omitting matters of general or military interest in favor of those of priestly interest. Even this abridgment of an abridgment is, however, full of lists as well as of narratives in detail of extraordinary interest. Hundreds of examples of lists of inventories, such as are here referred to, lists of tribute and supplies, reports of operations, accounts of expeditions with lists of things gathered, lists of building materials, the personnel of undertakings, etc., etc., were still extant in Egypt when Moses and Aaron are said to have been there. In the palace records of Harmhab e. g. were the "Regulations of the daily register" (Breasted iii, p. 31). This refers to a very common class of documents prescribing conduct, duties or routine for one or another class of functionaries, from those of vizier (Rekhmire. Breasted ii, pp.

270-295) down to the regulations established by the vizier for the officials, the prophets (p. 291), the brickmakers (p. 293). The Hebrew taskmasters had such a book of instructions. Another common class of documents was the census. For nearly two thousand years the "numbering" or census of "cattle", of "gold and lands", or "of all people of the nomes of the west, north, and east" had been common (Palermo Stone. Breasted i, pp. 59 *sq. passim*). About half way between the oldest and newest dates of the Exodus, Amenhotep the scribe, under king Amenhotep III (1411-1375) had the listing of the number of all the people put under his control as superior king's scribe over recruits. "I levied the military classes of my lord, my pen reckoned the numbers of millions".

These documents were for the most part, in Egypt, recorded on papyrus at first, but the more important law books, annals and the like were copied on leather, which was perhaps used before papyrus but which began to be very common about the time of the Exodus. The tablets of Amarna, Syria, Palestine, the Hittite lands and of Crete seem to show that clay was not only the usual material of Mesopotamia, but of much of the rest of the world in earlier times. On the other hand, however, the "archive" rooms of Crete seem to point to the use of papyrus or leather there and the adventures of Wenamon show that the roll had been in use on the coast of Syria for some generations before 1100 B. C. In all lands it was not unusual to inscribe important documents on stone, silver or other hard-substance tablets and to use wood tablets for memoranda. Public stone inscriptions containing codes, edicts, religious inscriptions, boundary inscriptions and memorials of all sorts existed in all lands but nowhere so abundantly as in Egypt.

These papyrus, leather or clay documents were naturally and almost universally kept in boxes or chests of convenient size, generally of wood, but sometimes of metal, pottery or stone. Single related documents on small rolls were put in small boxes of the right size with or without compartments

(the capsas). These small boxes might be round or angular, containing only the different rolls of a single work or various works. A very common variety in Egypt seems to have been about a foot square and two feet high with a sort of pouch top gathered and tied with strings. Another form was "longer than wide" or high, generally flat topped and serving as writing table. The two illustrations given by Birt (p. 15) and Pietschmann (p. 74) are about twice as wide as they are high. From these it is supposed that the portable book chests of later times—the "chest full of oracles" in Aristophanes' *Knights* i, 1000 *sq.*, the wood *narthax* in which Alexander carried his Homer, the stone *narthax* of the Sibylline books are descended. Such chests have been used as portable libraries in all ages of the world and today notably for the so-called "travelling libraries" sent out by many states of the United States. The ancient library at Edfou contained "many chests with books". These chests grew into cupboards of like size and shape, open at the end or side or both sides and with shelves or pigeonholes each holding one roll. As a matter of fact it was true in general, as Birt suggests, that the book chest was simply a treasure chest used for books.

The keeping up of the vast detail of the highly organized Egypt of this period required a great clerical army of book-keepers, secretaries, recorders, for the palace, legal, treasury, military staff, and temple purposes. Every nome had its large force of clerks. These were educated in the palace, temple, treasury, etc., schools "for all professions". Among those educated with the royal children in the palace schools were often those of humble birth, and considerable numbers of the children of Syrian and Palestinian petty princes, kept as hostages and Egyptianized with reference to succeeding their fathers or, if things happened badly, reduced to slavery.

Now it is in view of these literary circumstances that the documents of the Exodus appear natural in their own account of themselves and quite unnatural as composed at any

other place and time or in any other locality than that recorded in the documents themselves.

It is evident that under these circumstances not only would Moses or Aaron be likely to be educated in the temple or palace or treasury or other official schools, but rather a large number of the Hebrew "officers" set over their fellow slaves by the Egyptian taskmasters must have had a similar education. The officer was a "writer" or scribe. This seems quite accepted lexically (Brown-Driver-Briggs p. 1009), but apart from derivation the "officer" must have been in Egypt at this time a "scribe"—a chief part of his business, under that highly organized clerical system, being to record minutely all the details of the work and see that the book of regulations was strictly complied with. All the seventy chief aids whom Moses summoned a few months later, on the basis of a written list which had been prepared, were of this scribal class.

The fact that Moses himself was not eloquent, by no means suggests, to one familiar with the Anastasi papyrus, that he was uneducated. The eloquent son of Nennofre severely criticises and gibes at the style of his friend Nechtsotep. The latter, who is a military scribe, on the other hand reproaches the son of Nennofre, in turn, as being a worse official than he Nechtsotep is writer. Altogether the account (Erman pp. 380-81) gives a vivid reminder of the esteem in which eloquence was held, of the training which Aaron must have had, and of the difference between the military and civilian scribe, as suggesting the difference between the training of Moses and Aaron. It is not without significance that it is said that Aaron shall stand to Moses as a "prophet", for this suggests a point of connection with the Egyptian temple-prophet.

When the Hebrews left Egypt taking with them all the treasures and the raiment later mentioned, these things must naturally have been transported in chests and, if there were books, they would be carried also in one or more of these chests. It is not impossible that they did have ancestral his-

tories but this is another question. At all events as soon as documents began to accumulate on the march, they would be kept in one of these chests and this accumulation, according to the account, began soon: oracles, ephemerides, poems, at least. Between the fifteenth and thirtieth days of the second month it appears that already the oracular communications and the narrative registers of military events had begun in writing. The question of the poems of Moses and Miriam is different and need not confuse matters at this point. It may be said, however, in passing that they need cause no surprise if one remembers the Victory Hymn of Thutmose III (Breasted ii, pp. 263-6), and the hymn of Akhnation. However that may be, the oracles, "testimony", had begun to be kept in writing before, or soon after the fifteenth of the second month when Aaron "laid up" (technical word for putting away books or treasures in the treasury) the pot of manna with them. Shortly after, the battle with Amalek is committed to writing by divine command. Thenceforward we have account of a rapidly increasing mass of documents of various sorts.

Whether these were recorded on individual papyri or leather rolls or a continuous register was made by pasting the papyri together or by additions on long leather rolls is not indicated in the documents. On the face of later records one might guess that at least two registers were kept. Certainly the original documents were by several hands. However that may be and whether there was one series of rolls or several or many separate rolls, the general claim of the documents is that they form a register, like the palace registers of Egypt, like the book of the records of the words of days of the Persian times, and like the words, the words of days, and the book of the words of days, of the Jews from the time of Samuel on.

Just after the incident of Amalek, occurred another most significant incident resulting in another class of documents. Moses' father-in-law, visiting Moses, saw that he was wearing himself out trying to do all the judging himself, and,

therefore, advised him to teach the people the statutes and laws, rules of conduct and regulations for their work, also to appoint judges for the regular and minor matters, reserving for himself the hard cases. Moses accordingly chose able men for judges. Subsequently he went into the mountain and a code (the decalogue) was prepared together with a collection of such other previous decisions or general directions as he could recall among his own oral decisions or his private memoranda of such decisions. These he wrote down and erected into a formal contract with Jehovah by appropriate ceremony—reading the book of the covenant in their presence, getting their formal assent and sprinkling with blood in confirmation.

Then Moses went again into the mount for the more permanent copy of the decalogue on stone tablets—“and the law and the commandments, which I have written that thou mayest teach them”—this “teach” harking back to the advice of Jethro and the connecting events. He spends now with Joshua forty days during which the tablets were engraved and the elaborate directions for the tabernacle prepared, including first of all a suitable chest, or ark, in which to put the largely increased body of “testimony” or oracles, all the commandments, statutes, etc. After the breaking of the first tablets and rewriting the commandments on the second pair, Moses gives out directions for building the tabernacle. They were now six months out of Egypt and the tabernacle was not set up until the first month of the second year.

Meantime in the temporary tent of meeting with its temporary book-case Moses, with the help of Joshua again (Ex. 33: 11) or Aaron was preparing lists of regulations of various sorts as given in the book of Leviticus. In the first month of the second year the tabernacle was set up. In the second month the census of all able-bodied males, from twenty years up, was taken by Moses and Aaron and the twelve princes; also a census of Levites from one month upward, one of first born males from one month, and one of

Levites of from thirty to fifty years. Regulations for marching order and various other oracular provisions were made before the tabernacle was dedicated. One of these (Num. 5:23) calls for the use of writing. Then follow lists of offerings made when the tabernacle was finished; these are cast in document form.

After the dedication Moses entered the tabernacle and for the first time heard the voice from the Mercy seat which was upon the ark of the testimony. It was the last time too according to the records; from this time on it is no longer the ark of the testimony but the ark of the covenant. That day the cloud covered the tabernacle and remained there until the twentieth of the month when they broke camp.

The next few chapters of the register contain several references to records or to composition. First Moses makes out a list of seventy assistants from among the executive officers (the "scribes") of the people and summons them to the tent. These, including Eldad and Medad "prophe-sied". In this connection, perhaps, Miriam and Aaron were stirred up to claim that they too had received oracular messages from Jehovah. Then, after the incident of Korah, Dathan and Abiram the matter of the Levitical priesthood was taken up to God by means of the twelve inscribed rods and Aaron was chosen. A number more of oracles are given here, but with the twentieth chapter of Numbers begins a long narrative, sprinkled liberally with poems from the Wars of Jehovah or other sources, followed by another census for war purposes of those of twenty years old and upward and another of the Levites from one month. Aaron having died meantime these censuses were made by Moses and Eleazar. Then followed a few more oracles, narratives, a strict itinerary, a list of those appointed to divide the land, etc. The book of Numbers ends with a chronologically most appropriate document registering the decision as to the daughters of Zelophehad.

Then follows the resumé of Deuteronomy, written on a

roll and put by the side of the ark but prepared from the register for inscription on the temple walls. To this are added a couple of poems and a little final narrative.

The book of Joshua is very different in bibliographical form from Exodus-Numbers. It is not a register but a narrative although evidently based on and containing the substance of many documents. Even oracles are not given as individual documents. Joshua's first action was a public eulogy of the law of Moses, and soon after crossing the Jordan, according to the text, he had this engraved in full on a great stone stela or altar as Moses had directed. He also had a topographical survey written as basis for the distribution of land among the tribes. Eleazar appears as his right hand man in all matters, as he was the right hand man of Moses in his latter days, and as Aaron had been to Moses before. At the end, Joshua makes the people renew their covenant with Jehovah and wrote these words in the "book of the law of God", thus apparently continuing the old records. The book ends with a memorandum of the death of Eleazar and his burial in the hill of Phinehas.

Judges again is narrative founded on documents but on miscellaneous documents not connected with official journals.

In brief thus the documents as they stand have the bibliographical form of (1) a daily register such as was common among the Egyptians and afterwards known among the Jews as "words" ("words of Samuel"), words of days, book of the words of days or most fully book of the records of the words of days. This, which is commonly translated chronicles or annals, was, as Driver says (*Introd.* p. 177) "an official journal", including such matters as genealogies, oracles, censuses (that of David), treaties, letters, public votes of thanks (1 Maccabees) and other whole documents; (2) an abstract and summary intended to be engraved on the walls of an altar or temple and so actually inscribed by Joshua, as the abstract of Thutmose III was made for the temple library and again from this for inscription; (3) a

history based on official registers like the books of Kings and Chronicles, but not itself a register; (4) a history based on scattered documents (Judges).

This historical progression of literary forms is as natural as the forms themselves. The death of Joshua left a book of the law of God in the sanctuary at Shechem and the transmission of previous registers or other books through the ark is clear enough to this point, although, curiously enough, all mention of the ark falls out after chapter eight which tells how the law was engraved on stone.

The transmission through the ark was, however, not the only transmission. Of course the Mishna account of a copy of the law having been made for each tribe has no authority, but in that the laws were prepared for the use of the judges and for teaching Israel, as is repeatedly said, there can be little doubt that, if the documents are to be believed, each tribe had at least one copy from the time of Sinai and that to these copies from time to time were added at least the decisions in cases taken up to God by Moses, Aaron, Eleazar or Joshua.

After the death of Eleazar cases were still taken up to God when the ark was at Bethel and decisions rendered by Phinehas. No doubt the sanctuary where the ark was always had a certain precedence but the separation of the tribes into three groups made it, of course, difficult to take cases to the central shrine and obviously these were more and more decided by tribal judges. There is no mention of the ark in the book of Judges after the time of Phinehas, but it appears again with Eli at Shiloh. Here thus was one main line of transmission in Ephraim and no doubt there were others in Judah and across the Jordan.

It is an interesting fact, perhaps not without bearing on the question of transmission, that, while there is but one mention of the ark in Judges (and that in parenthesis) and none after the time of Phinehas, references to the metal ephod begin here. The ephod seems to have been any sort of a receptacle, cloth or metal, which contained the instru-

ments of securing the judicial decision, i. e. the Urim and Thummin—or the lots. It even seems to have been like the figures of Egyptian gods standing on a box which sometimes contains the utterances of these gods. By analogy therefore and natural circumstances the ephod might have contained the roll of decisions. However that may be, written leather rolls were, under the circumstances described in the documents, undoubtedly transmitted, with local decisions added and, no doubt, local historical or administrative additions in the margins.

Facing these documents as one would any historical documents, and assuming that their own account of themselves, being natural and consistent with itself and with the circumstances, has at least *prima facie* value as evidence, it is possible to form a picture of a body of written documents by various authors, one copy at least kept officially in the usual book case of the time, others in appropriate cases by the judges, annotated, “midrashed”, added to more or less for several centuries, neighboring copies more or less edited together into J and E, these again edited together and with D hitherto transmitted separately, and later in 444 all edited together. This process of accumulative transmission of written documents on an original written core is the commonest in literary history. The three transmitted works with which the writer of this paper is familiar textually and historically are (1) the Clementine Recognitions, (2) the *Illustrious Men* of Jerome and Gennadius and (3) the *Golden Legend*. Each of these, within two centuries of its first composition, shows very large accretions. For the first take the story of Clement (J) and the preaching of Peter (E) and put these together early in the second century. Add to these in the middle of the second century the works of a Greek apologist (D) and at the end of the century the work of Bardesanes on fate (P). In the early third century you have thus the Clementine J E D P. Gennadius is itself a continuation of Jerome and each of these authors has, in turn, various chapters added in various transmissions and special

additions to chapters, e. g. one to Augustine which is many times the original chapter. Again Caxton's version of the Golden Legend contains much more than the French translation from which it is taken and this in turn much more than Varagine's Latin original—which indeed, like his Chronicle of Genoa, may have contained much less in his own first edition than in the final edition before his death. The variety and extent of these additions are such that it may be very much doubted whether there is any limit to what may, or may not, be regarded as editorial addition or change in written documents, although, as has already been said, it is very much to be doubted whether in the case of the documents of the Exodus this addition will in fact be found to be very much.

The question of authorship goes beyond bibliographical into historical criticism. It belongs to better Biblical scholars than the writer. Nevertheless one may venture the suggestion that certain tests of matters connected with the various writers mentioned suggest the possibility that J E, D and P may be distinguished among original documents, that the peculiarities of J and E may be distinguished as additions or changes during transmission and that the various late chronological features may be attached to the various redactors. The references to Eleazar and Phinehas e. g. fall in such way within the "priests code", as usually analyzed, as to suggest that these may have been later edited in by Eleazar or Phinehas from memory or memoranda. A purely bibliographical first hypothesis might be that J E represents writings by Joshua, Hur and other royal and political scribes, and P writings by Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas and other sacred scribes, while D was carried out by Moses himself or some one other scribe under his directions, and the pre-conquest portions were edited by both Joshua and Eleazar or Phinehas. This may probably not outlast the first historical critical examination, but it may serve well enough as starting point for a sound criticism of the fundamental bibliographical hypothesis of a substantial

core of literary documents with manuscript transmission—the only hypothesis which, in the respectful, undogmatic judgment of the writer, is admissible, in view of what is known of the literary circumstances of the time of the Exodus.

E. C. RICHARDSON.

Princeton University Library.

DR. WATTS' "RENOVATION OF PSALMODY."*

III

HIS SUCCESS: THE ERA OF WATTS.

III. IN AMERICA.

I. THE CONGREGATIONALISTS.

When Watts' *Hymns* of 1707 and his *Imitations* of 1719 appeared, the Puritan sense of the duty of singing Psalms prevailed generally in New England, although "cases of conscience" still kept alive the memory of the "controversy concerning singing."⁹¹ But the total neglect of music had compelled the suspension of all singing in some congregations, and in others had brought about conditions in Church Praise which the Rev. Mr. Symmes described as "indecent."⁹² In the lack of music books and the inability to sing by note, a very few tunes were sung from memory, "tortured and twisted as every unskillful throat saw fit," producing a medley of discordant noises; sounding, as Mr. Walter reports,⁹³ "like five hundred different tunes roared out at the same time", with the singers often one or two words apart, and in a manner so drawling that he himself has "twice in one note paused to take breath".

Inconceivable as it seems, this disorder had acquired the force of a tradition, and the attempt to better it involved the churches in years of bitter controversy between the advocates of "the usual way" and those determined to introduce "regular singing."

* Being the third of the lectures upon "The Hymnody of the English-speaking Churches," delivered in the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary in February 1910.

⁹¹ *Cases of Conscience about singing of Psalms*, Boston, 1723. It is reprinted in S. H. Emory, *The Ministry of Taunton*, 2 vols., Boston, 1853, vol. i, pp. 269 ff.

⁹² *The Reasonableness of Regular Singing*, Boston, 1720.

⁹³ *The Grounds and Rules of Musick explained*, by Thomas Walter, A.M., Boston, 1721.

Through these confusions the voice of Watts did not reach the people at all. He none the less had his eye on New England. Before his *Imitations* were printed, some were submitted in Ms. to Cotton Mather for his examination and approval:⁹⁴ the 107th of *The Psalms imitated* was entitled "A Psalm for New England": he sent over copies of all his books, and was, through correspondence with Colman and others, kept informed of conditions. Meantime he was content to bide his time, and discouraged his friends from premature efforts to introduce his "System of Praise".⁹⁵

The first American reprint of *The Psalms imitated* came from the Philadelphia press of Benjamin Franklin in 1729. It represents no actual demand, since Franklin afterwards complained of its remaining unsold upon his shelves.⁹⁶ Franklin published another reprint in 1741; and in the same year appeared the first Boston edition (Rogers and Fowle).

The first American reprint of the *Hymns* appeared in Boston, 1739 (J. Draper for D. Henchman):⁹⁷ the first Philadelphia edition in 1742 (Franklin): the first New York edition (Hugh Gaine) in 1752.⁹⁸

Throughout New England it was only as one and another parish first reëstablished the old Psalmody on a musical basis, that any need was felt for more singable materials than *The Bay Psalm Book* furnished. Even then there was

⁹⁴ See letter in George Hood, *A History of Music in New England*, Boston, 1846, p. 155.

⁹⁵ See his correspondence in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 2nd series, vol. ix, especially pp. 397, 401, 408.

⁹⁶ Cf. Paul L. Ford, *The Many-sided Franklin*, N. Y., 1899, p. 195; There is also a facsimile of the title-page.

⁹⁷ Not in Evans' *American Bibliography*.

⁹⁸ The early American reprints of Watts may be grouped as follows:
Psalms alone: Philadelphia, 1729, 1741, 1753, 1757, 1760, 1766, 1773. Boston, 1741, 1743, 1761, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1770, 1771, 1772(2). New York, 1754, 1756, 1760, 1772. Woodbridge, 1760. Norwich, 1773, 1774.
Hymns alone: Boston, 1739, 1743, 1769, 1771, 1772 (2), 1775. Philadelphia, 1742, 1767, 1771, 1772. New York, 1752, 1771. Norwich, 1775.
Psalms and Hymns together (earlier issues were sometimes bound together): New York, 1761. Boston, 1767, 1773. Philadelphia, 1778.

no general turning toward Watts. It was rather in congregations deeply moved by the revival influences of "The Great Awakening" that the desire arose for song more in consonance with the revival preaching and more expressive of the evangelical fervor which the preaching aroused. The coming of Whitefield and his large share in the Great Awakening might be presupposed to favor the introduction of the hymns of the Wesleyan Revival, out of which he came. But he was no singing evangelist, and never a propagandist of the Methodist Hymnody: he preferred a sober strain of song, and greatly admired Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*.

At Northampton itself Jonathan Edwards, returning from a journey, found that the congregation had begun to sing Watts' *Hymns* in his absence; "and sang nothing else, and neglected the Psalms wholly." He "disliked not their making some use of the Hymns; but did not like their setting aside the Psalms", and compromised by arranging that when they sang "three times upon the Sabbath", they should sing "an Hymn, or part of a Hymn of Dr. Watts's, the last time, *viz.* at the conclusion of afternoon exercise."⁹⁹

This was in 1742, and shows how with the spread of the revival the people began to sing from Watts with a certain spontaneity in which sincerity counted for more than precedent. The singing was not confined to the meetings. John White reports¹⁰⁰ that at Gloucester in 1744 the singing of Watts's *Hymns* had taken the place of the usual diversions of the people when met together. A new phenomenon was the "singing through the streets, and in Ferry-Boats" by companies of people coming or going between the meetings. To this Chauncy objected as "ostentatious".¹⁰¹ Gilbert Tennent, in a letter in *The Pennsyl-*

⁹⁹ Letter of Edwards in *Proceedings of Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 2nd series, vol. x, p. 429.

¹⁰⁰ *The Christian History*, Boston, vol. i, 1743, p. 41.

¹⁰¹ *Seasonable Thoughts on the state of Religion in New England*, Boston, 1743, p. 126.

vania Gazette, refused to defend it:¹⁰² Jonathan Edwards on the other hand failed to find any valid objection against it.¹⁰³ Edwards thought "abounding in singing", both in and out of meeting, a natural expression of the feelings awakened.¹⁰⁴ The disorderly singing in meeting, and the careless singing of sacred words at home,¹⁰⁵ he liked no better than Chauncy.¹⁰⁶ To the objection taken by many to the "making use of Hymns of humane Composure", Edwards responded in terms as decided as those of Watts himself.¹⁰⁷

In parishes which kept to the old Psalmody through the revival period, the introduction of either the Imitations or Hymns of Watts involved difficulties. Apart from the prejudice of many against hymns¹⁰⁸ and their affection for *The Bay Psalm Book*, the free character of Watts' Imitations and his omission of several Psalms¹⁰⁹ told against it. There was also a preference of many others, especially the 'liberal'-minded, for the smooth renderings of *Tate and Brady*.¹¹⁰

The parish of Spencer, Mass., affords an illustration of the actual situation. After making trial for some time of *Tate and Brady*, the church met in June, 1761 and decided to restore *The Bay Psalm Book* for four Sabbaths, then to use Watts' Imitations till September, and finally meet for decision. At the meeting the vote stood, for *The Bay Psalm Book*, 33; for Watts, 14; for *Tate and Brady*, 6. It was agreed to refer the matter to three ministers, who recommended a trial of *Tate and Brady* for six months. After eight years of adherence to *The Bay Psalm Book*, it was voted in May 1769, to make the trial of *Tate and Brady* as

¹⁰² Reprinted in his *The Examiner, examined, or Gilbert Tennent Harmonious*, Phila. 1743. pp. 64-66.

¹⁰³ *Some Thoughts concerning the present Revival of Religion in New-England*, Boston, 1742, pp. 317-323.

¹⁰⁴ *Some Thoughts*, p. 182.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

¹⁰⁶ *Seasonable Thoughts*, p. 239.

¹⁰⁷ *Some Thoughts*, p. 184.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. *Proc. of Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 2nd series, vol. ix, pp. 401, 408.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

recommended. There was a dissatisfied minority, and it was agreed to use *The Bay Psalm Book* and Watts jointly "till the church and congregation shall come to a better understanding as to what version may be sung". This arrangement continued until October, 1769, when it was agreed to adopt Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*, by a vote of 26 in his favor, and "about 6 votes for the old version."¹¹¹ Even so Spencer was years ahead of very many New England parishes.

A number of churches followed the lead of the Brattle Street Church, to which we shall more particularly refer, in adopting *Tate and Brady*, supplemented by a selection of hymns taken mostly from Watts: Worcester in 1761,¹¹² Newton in 1770,¹¹³ Charlestown in 1772,¹¹⁴ Westminster in 1773.¹¹⁵ The Old South of Boston balked at the freedom of Watts' Imitations, and requested Thomas Prince to make a revision of *The Bay Psalm Book*, to which, as published and introduced in 1758, was added an appendix of fifty hymns, all but eight of which are from Watts.¹¹⁶ On the other hand the Imitations, without the *Hymns*, were adopted by the South Church at Portsmouth, N. H., as early as 1763,¹¹⁷ and in 1769 Byfield voted to "make trial" of both.¹¹⁸

The parishes were thus feeling their way and of many minds. The use of Watts' *Psalms and Hymns* did not become general throughout New England Congregationalism until after the Revolution. They were introduced at the

¹¹¹ Jas. Draper, *History of Spencer, Massachusetts*, Worcester, 2nd ed., n. d., pp. 110, 111.

¹¹² W. Lincoln, *Hist. of Worcester*, 1837, p. 179.

¹¹³ F. Jackson, *Hist. of Newton*, 1854, p. 136.

¹¹⁴ *Memorial Hist. of Boston*, vol. ii, p. 319.

¹¹⁵ W. S. Heywood, *Hist. of Westminster*, 1893, p. 282.

¹¹⁶ *The Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs of the Old and New Testament, . . . being the New England Psalm Book revised and improved . . . with an addition of fifty other Hymns . . . Boston: N.E., 1758, 2nd ed., 1773.*

¹¹⁷ C. W. Brewster, *Rambles about Portsmouth*, 2nd series, 1869, p. 338.

¹¹⁸ Joshua Coffin, *Sketch of Hist. of Newbury, &c.*, 1845, p. 235.

Old South in Boston in 1786: in 1790 at Worcester¹¹⁹ and Newton:¹²⁰ in 1791 at Shrewsbury.¹²¹ To make the Imitations palatable at that epoch to the newly won liberties of America, some changes were necessary in those passages in which Watts had made David appear as a patriotic Englishman. Outside of Connecticut these changes were made without common action of the churches, under the auspices of private printers.

Connecticut, which had its distinctive church government, took also a distinctive attitude toward Watts. In the first place its adoption of his System of Praise included only the Imitations. In the second place, the Connecticut Association superintended two revisions of their text, with a view of 'accommodating it to America' and also of filling out the omitted Psalms. The earlier of these¹²² appeared at Hartford in 1785 as *Doctor Watts's Imitation of the Psalms of David, corrected and enlarged by Joel Barlow*. The later was made with the concurrence of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and appeared at Hartford in 1801 as *The Psalms of David . . . by I. Watts, D.D. A new edition, in which the Psalms, omitted by Dr. Watts, are versified, local passages are altered, and a number of Psalms are versified anew, in proper metres. By Timothy Dwight*.¹²³ In the third place, the Connecticut Association, while proposing to retain *The Psalms Imitated* as the main feature of Church Praise, provided its own collection of hymns (in the stead of Watts' *Hymns*) as an appendix to the Psalms. The hymns appended to Barlow's revision numbered 70, se-

¹¹⁹ Lincoln, p. 179.

¹²⁰ Jackson, p. 141.

¹²¹ A. H. Ward, *History of Shrewsbury*, 1847, p. 179.

¹²² The history of these various adaptations of Watts' Psalms to American conditions is an interesting and distinctive episode in the progress of American Church Song. But in spirit and intent they were a prolongation of the older Psalmody, to whose history a fuller account of them may be relegated. The writer has attempted such an account in "The American Revisions of Watts's Psalms" in *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, for June and Sept., 1903.

¹²³ In this appeared the familiar "I love Thy Kingdom, Lord", as a rendering of the 137th Psalm.

lected from Watts, with a few originals added. Like the revision itself, they were set aside when Barlow's name became discredited in Connecticut. Dwight, between his own preference for a large collection and that of a number of his advisers for a small one,¹²⁴ compromised on an appendix of 263 hymns. Of these 168 were from Watts, 95 by other writers, mostly of Watts' school. "Dwight's Watts" was received with great favour and used in Connecticut churches, perhaps without an exception; and in some for over thirty years.¹²⁵

Dwight's book was not interfered with by *The Hartford Selection of Hymns*, 1797, edited by Nathan Strong, Abel Flint, and Joseph Steward. This reached a sixth edition in 1818, but was especially designed for use in connection with revival services. Some pastors were, however, finding Dwight's selection of hymns too limited. He had spoken in his preface of the "so great reverence" for Watts in this country at that time. Of this, Samuel Worcester of Salem, warmly interested in Church Song, was made painfully aware. He thought room could be made for the new hymns desired and for a selection of tunes in one volume with Watts' *Psalms and Hymns* by the process of dropping some of the less used Psalms and shortening the longer ones. A volume so made up he published at Boston in 1815 as *Christian Psalmody, in four parts*. The churches resented this mode of dealing with Watts' Psalms, and the book was met by charges of "mangling", "amputating", and "robbing" Watts, and by calls for "Watts Entire."¹²⁶ In view of this prejudice and demand and the solicitation of his publisher, Worcester abandoned his *Christian Psalmody*, enlarged the selection of hymns it contained, and, against his own taste and judgment, appended them to the complete *Psalms and Hymns* of Watts. The new

¹²⁴ See his preface of 1800.

¹²⁵ Cf. O. E. Daggett, "The Psalms in Worship," *The New Englander*, July 1846, p. 328.

¹²⁶ S. M. Worcester, *Life of Rev. Samuel Worcester*, Boston, 1852, vol. ii, p. 267.

collection appeared at Boston in 1819 as *The Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs of the Rev. Isaac Watts, D.D., to which are added select Hymns from other authors; and directions for musical expression. By Samuel Worcester, D.D.* It was revised in 1823, and again in 1834 by his son, and came into wide use throughout New England and even beyond it. Familiarly known as "Watts and Select", it became one of the best recognized channels of Watts' ascendancy over Church Song, and so continued as long as the churches were disposed to regard the ever widening area of English Hymnody in the light of an appendage to Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*.

The transition from the older Psalmody to Watts in New England became associated after the Revolutionary War with a great change in the character of the tunes used in the churches. This was brought about through the efforts of an eccentric but gifted tanner's apprentice of Boston, William Billings, who had printed in 1770 his first book of original compositions, as *The New-England Psalm-Singer: or, American Chorister, containing a number of Psalm-tunes, Anthems and Canons. In four or five parts. [Never before published.] Composed by William Billings, a native of Boston, in New England* (Boston, Edes and Gill). The book proved acceptable to New England singing schools. During the war Billings wrote or adapted patriotic Psalms, and set them to stirring melodies of his own composition. His original "Let tyrants shake their iron rod", to his tune "Chester", and his "Lamentation over Boston", beginning "By the Rivers of Watertown we sat down and wept", are now best remembered.¹²⁷ The words stirred the patriotic heart, and with their striking melodies were sung at home and by the choirs, and especially in the military camps. The New England soldiers learned the words by heart, and every fifer the tunes, and carried them to whatever part of the country duty called them.

In 1778 Billings published at Boston *The Singing Mas-*

¹²⁷ Words and music may be found in his *The Singing Master's Assistant*, 1778; the former as No. 12, the latter as No. 33.

ter's Assistant, or Key to Practical Music. Its tunes of lively rhythm and captivating melody, with much independence of movement in the various voice-parts and some unexpected harmonic results, proved very popular with singing schools and church choirs, and drove out the slower and more solemn Psalm-tunes. Billings established a distinctively American school of church music,¹²⁸ carried on by Jacob Kimball, Oliver Holden, Daniel Reed, Timothy Swan, and others, who were his followers; and it dominated Congregational Song in New England for many years.

The new music, while tickling the senses, lacked the reverence and spiritual feeling of the old. But the close of the Revolution was particularly distinguished for the absence of just those qualities; and the swing and virility of the new tunes suited the occasion, while the exciting contests of the voice-parts gave welcome occupation to the singing schools and the new choirs. The new style of church music did not spread over New England without considerable protest. The growing volume and earnestness of this protest, together with the spread of better musical knowledge and taste, were eventually to clear the way for the Lowell Mason epoch in American church music.

Meantime, Andrew Law, one of the most successful "Professors of Psalmody" contemporaneous with Billings, seems to have resisted his influence, and aimed to avoid "fuguing tunes". It is likely also that Samuel Holyoke re-

¹²⁸ The personality and work of this one-eyed, illtaught, and enthusiastic natural genius, form an engaging theme, from whatever view-point it be approached. The only adequate materials for studying him are the music, treatises, prefaces, &c. contained in the series of his tune books. The most satisfactory approaches to the musical side of his work are found in Dr. F. R. Ritter's *Music in America*, new. ed. New York, 1890, chap. iii; and Louis C. Elson's *The History of American Music*, New York, 1904, chap. i. Something of the human side appears in George P. Upton's *Musical Pastels*, Chicago, 1902, in a sketch of him, wrongly entitled "The first American Composer." It is now well established that both Hopkinson and Lyon were his predecessors (see O. G. Sonneck, *Francis Hopkinson and James Lyon*, Washington, 1905); though the fact abates nothing of Billings' original force.

garded *The Columbian Repository of Sacred Harmony* (Exeter, N. H., n. d.), which he published in the first decade of the XIXth century, as adapted to forward the reaction from the extremes of the Billings school. Whether it was so or not, his book remains as a colossal monument of the ascendancy of Watts over the Congregational Praise of New England. This folio volume of 496 pages contains nothing less than a complete reprint of Watts' *Psalms of David imitated*¹²⁹ and his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, with every Psalm version and hymn set to its special tune in four parts. As an offering to New England choirs, unable to read at sight or to use so great a variety of music, it was ineffective from the first; but as a tribute to Dr. Watts its testimony remains unimpaired.

The closing pages of Holyoke's book are occupied by a "Supplement" of tunes "suited to Metres in *Dr. Belknap's* and *Tate & Brady's* Psalms and Hymns, which are not in Dr. Watts'." This supplement serves to remind us that a dissenting type of Congregational Hymnody had already risen in New England, which now demands consideration.

2. THE EARLY UNITARIANS.

The church at Brattle Square, Boston, had been the first to break away from the fixed order of New England Congregationalism. Though regarded as radical, it was organized upon the basis of the Westminster Confession, and in the matter of Church Praise was most conservative. When Thomas Brattle, whose will was probated May 23, 1713, bequeathed his organ to the church, the congregation voted that they did not think it proper to use the same in the public worship of God.¹³⁰ To the efforts of its pastor, Benjamin Colman, Watts attributed the introduction of his

¹²⁹ Holyoke seems to have taken as his text for the Imitations an Americanized version first printed by Isaiah Thomas at Worcester in 1786, and characterized by its omission of the C. M. Version of Psalm 21.

¹³⁰ S. K. Lothrop, *History of Brattle-Street Church*, Boston, 1851, pp. 61, 62: more fully in "The first Organ in America", *New England Magazine*, Oct. 1902, pp. 212 ff.

Imitations into several New England parishes.¹³¹ In 1739 Colman got his church to vote for a collection of hymns to be selected from Watts, but found that even the attempt to use a new version of the Psalms so endangered the peace of the church that he decided to leave things as they were.¹³² Nevertheless the Brattle Street Church, after Colman's death, led the way in hymn singing among Boston churches, adopting in 1753 *Tate and Brady* with an appendix of hymns to be selected by a committee.¹³³ This appeared in 1754 as *Appendix, containing a number of Hymns, taken chiefly from Dr. Watts's Scriptural Collection*, and was enlarged from time to time to include 103 hymns.¹³⁴ *Tate and Brady* with this appendix, and sometimes with D. Bayley's *Essex Harmony* or his *Psalm Singer's Assistant*, bound in, appeared often in the next half century, and became the means of introducing hymns of Watts into a number of parishes.

The installation of Jonathan Mayhew over the West Church in 1747 was the first definite recognition of the Arian opinions and tendencies which had crossed over from English Presbyterianism; and by the last quarter of the century nearly all the Congregational pulpits in and near Boston were filled by Unitarians.¹³⁵

Mayhew found *Tate and Brady* in use at the West Church, and asked for no change during his life, though a choir took the place of the precentor about 1754.¹³⁶ No hymns were sung in the West Church till the appearance in 1783 of *A Collection of Hymns, more particularly designed for the use of the West Society in Boston*, (2nd ed. 1803;

¹³¹ *Proc. of Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 2nd series, vol. ix, pp. 365, 397.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 365.

¹³³ See preface to "Brattle Square Collection," 1825.

¹³⁴ The hymns numbered 77-100 in the *Appendix to Tate and Brady* published by S. Kneeland, Boston, 1760, were an addition to the Brattle Street Appendix made by Mather Byles for the Hollis Street Church.

¹³⁵ Cf. A. P. Peabody in *The Memorial History of Boston*, vol. iii, pp. 467 ff.

¹³⁶ Chas. Lowell, Discourse in the West Church, Boston, 1820, p. 26.

3rd, 1806). Its opening hymns were entitled "Toleration" and "Persecution", but it contained also hymns on "Jesus, worshipped by all the Creation", "The Atonement of Christ", and "Christ's Propitiation improv'd". William Bentley of the East Church, Salem, followed with *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for publick worship* (Salem, n. d., but 1788 or 1789).¹³⁷ Its only interest lies in the selection, at so early a date, of the *Salisbury Selection* of 1778 as the source of nearly all its hymns. Six years later Jeremy Belknap "performed a very important service for the non-Trinitarian churches"¹³⁸ by publishing *Sacred Poetry. Consisting of Psalms and Hymns, adapted to Christian devotion, public and private. Selected from the best authors, with variations and additions* (Boston, 1795). This important (it has been called "famous")¹³⁹ book has been described by Dr. Peabody¹⁴⁰ "as an index of the religious belief and feeling of the churches that welcomed its advent." If so, it would be easy to show that the churches held all the cardinal doctrines of Calvinism. But Belknap's own curious point of view is thus revealed in his preface:

"In this selection those Christians, who do not scruple to sing praise to their Redeemer and Sanctifier, will find materials for such a sublime enjoyment; whilst others whose tenderness of conscience may oblige them to confine their addresses, to the Father only will find no deficiency of matter suited to their idea of 'the chaste and awful spirit of devotion'."¹⁴¹

Belknap's book won great favor, and continued to satisfy a considerable proportion of the "non-Trinitarian churches" through and beyond the first quarter of the XIXth century.¹⁴² Freeman's *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for publick worship* (Boston, 1799: 2nd ed., 1813), for

¹³⁷ The writer's copy was "The Gift of the Rev. Mr. Bentley, 1789."

¹³⁸ Dr. Peabody in *Memorial History of Boston*, vol. iii, p. 473.

¹³⁹ By Dr. S. A. Eliot, in *Heralds of a Liberal Faith*, Boston, 1910, vol. i, p. 103.

¹⁴⁰ *ut supra*.

¹⁴¹ In Watts' familiar line "Save in the death of Christ my God," Belknap's only alteration was the substitution of "But" for "Save".

¹⁴² 2nd ed., 1797; 3rd, 1801; 4th, 1804; 5th, 1808; new. ed., 1812, often reprinted.

King's Chapel, was made from its American predecessors just referred to, the English books from the Liverpool Collection of 1763 to Enfield's of 1795, and *Tate and Brady*. In 1808, the year of Henry Ware's election as Hollis Professor at Harvard, the Brattle Street Church annexed to its collection *Hymns for Public Worship. Part ii*; whose exclusion of "most of the capital doctrines of the gospel" was at once challenged by *The Panoplist*.¹⁴³ From the Panoplist's point of view William Emerson's *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns* (Boston, 1808), was even more open to the same charge. His book was ineffective, but interesting for an attempt to refine and enrich "Columbian musick" by "prefixing to each psalm and hymn the name of a tune, well composed and judiciously chosen" as "a valuable auxiliary to musical bands."

To Philadelphia Unitarianism came directly from England with Dr. Priestley; and in 1812 Ralph Eddowes and James Taylor, who had charge of the little congregation Priestley founded, published *A Selection of Sacred Poetry, consisting of Psalms and Hymns from Watts, Doddridge, Merrick, Scott, Cowper, Barbauld, Steele, and others*.¹⁴⁴ Eddowes had already published a tract on *The Inconsistency of several passages in Doctor Watts's Hymns with Scripture and with each other*.¹⁴⁵ But, the inexpediency of using "Watts entire" being thus demonstrated, Eddowes drew freely from him and other evangelical sources, and in his collection of 606 hymns aimed not unsuccessfully to avoid offence to the orthodox bodies that enveloped his little congregation.

Little account of the Philadelphia book was taken in New England, although the situation there was regarded as unsatisfactory. It was becoming a matter of reproach that numerous churches, though now enrolled on the "liberal"

¹⁴³ See the review in the number for Sept. 1808; the reply of "Brattle Street" and editorial comments thereon in the Nov. number.

¹⁴⁴ 2nd ed., 1818; 3rd, 1828; 4th, 1846.

¹⁴⁵ Included in *A Coll. of Pieces and Tracts* pub. by the First Unitarian Society, Phila., 1810.

side, persisted in using Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*, to which they had formerly become attached.¹⁴⁶ And not less so that of all the books aiming to supersede Watts or Psalm versions, the "only collection now in common use" was Belknap's, with "its unnatural combination of eager Arianism and half-willing Orthodoxy".¹⁴⁷ Two books were prepared with a view of meeting this situation. The earlier was Henry F. Sewall's *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns, for social and private worship* (N. Y. 1820; 2nd ed., 1827). This urbane expression of "a calm and rational faith" was favorably regarded by Boston periodicals,¹⁴⁸ but failed of adoption by New England churches. It retains, however, the distinction of introducing five originals of William Cullen Bryant. The other book had a nearly similar title, *A Selection of Hymns and Psalms, for social and private worship* (Andover, 1821; 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1824; 11th ed., Boston, 1832). It was compiled by J. P. Dabney, with an eye for practical considerations: being smaller, cheaper, better arranged, and with less tinkering of familiar texts, than Sewall's. It came into very considerable, though far from universal, use in the churches. We may perhaps regard these two books, and the new West Church *Collection* of 1823, as closing the earlier series of liberal or Unitarian hymn books; to be followed in turn by the remarkable series of a more "literary" type that distinguished the mid-century.

The books of this early period are characterized by their omissions rather than their inclusions, as being the work of men (except perhaps Freeman), who "had not made up their own minds" "on the subject of the nature and offices of Jesus."¹⁴⁹ Meantime they avoided the area "still controverted among Christians" (Sewall), and "what savors of party spirit and sectarian notions" (Emerson). This meant

¹⁴⁶ *The Christian Disciple*, vol. iii, 1821, p. 341.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 362.

¹⁴⁸ E. g. *The Christian Disciple* for 1821, pp. 76, 360-369.

¹⁴⁹ Ralph Waldo Emerson, in Sprague, *Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit*, New York, 1865, p. 245.

practically to alter or omit the older hymns of evangelical implication and to multiply hymns confined to "the natural or universal aspects of religion." It resulted, except in the case of Belknap's anomalous book, in a marked coldness of tone as contrasted with Watts'. Belknap, Emerson, Edlowes and Sewall avowedly aim to adapt their books to "Christians in general." Dabney is the only one who recognizes that his "cannot meet with very general acceptance."

3. THE PRESBYTERIANS.

The Presbyterian Church of the colonies was by its varied inheritance and its own practice a Psalm singing Church. It cannot, however, be claimed that an exclusively Scriptural Psalmody was made a church principle, since the Adopting Act of 1729 failed to include the Westminster *Directory for Worship* as a part of its written constitution. Neither was there any special Psalm book in prescribed or even general use. But the hold of the Scottish type of Psalmody was materially strengthened by the great volume of immigration from the North of Ireland. The Scotch-Irish brought with them *The Psalms of David in Meeter* bound in with their Bibles, and to their minds almost a part of it. They had been accustomed to a Scriptural Psalmody as of course: few of them knew any Psalm book but their own: and they were not of the temper that is personally concerned with the literary or musical development of Church Song.

Thus reinforced, the whole lump of Presbyterianism became more impervious than some other Churches were to the leaven of Watts' influence. Indeed, the Scotch-Irish gift for colonization tended to remove whole sections of the Church beyond contact with that influence. It carried large numbers away from the established centres of civilization, and segregated them in frontier settlements, where their own ways were unquestioned and their minds became incurious. And so it could happen, that, when in 1763 the reunited Synod of New York and Philadelphia was questioned as to whether churches were at liberty "to sing Dr. Watts's imitation of David's Psalms". the Synod was not

prepared to give a full answer, "As a great number of this body have never particularly considered Dr. Watts's imitation."¹⁵⁰

There was, on the other hand, within the Church an aggressive element, Scotch and Scotch-Irish, well informed as to Watts' work and influence, and fully prepared to resist it. And just beyond the Church's borders a number of small bodies was forming, who represented one or other form of Scottish dissent; unalterably set in principle on the strictest platform of Psalm singing, and in practice confined to "Rous' Version." Neither their principles nor interest called them to quench the embers of strife in the larger body or to refuse a refuge to the disaffected.

Under these circumstances it was inevitable that Presbyterian hymn singing should be deferred, and that its introduction should involve controversy. There was indeed no general desire to sing hymns among Colonial Presbyterians. The progressives asked no more than liberty to choose their own Psalm book; and it was not till the beginning of the XIXth century that the Church declared itself in favor of singing hymns.

The first influence that modified the uniformity of the old Psalmody, among Presbyterians as among Congregationalists, was the quickened evangelical fervor aroused by the Great Awakening; which revival became indeed the occasion of splitting the Church itself in 1741 into "New Side" and "Old Side" synods.

This influence is nowhere more clearly brought out than in the *apologia* of the Trustees of the Church in New York for the change in their congregational Psalmody.¹⁵¹

The minority at once organized as a Scotch Presbyterian

¹⁵⁰ *Records of the Presbyterian Church*, ed. 1904, p. 331.

¹⁵¹ *Ms. Journal*, quoted in Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, New York, 1885, pp. 280, 281.

"That during the times of the Revival of Religion in the years 1739, 1740 and 1741, when God said to this church, arise, shine for thy light is come, &c., there was a vast accession of people to this Light and to the brightness of this churches rising; in that period the poetick writings particularly the Hymns of the sweet singer of our Israel

Society, and complained to Presbytery, which body referred the matter to the (New Side) Synod of New York. Synod in 1752 appointed a committee to adjust the difficulties, with power to authorize the use of Watts' Imitations, and a larger committee in 1753. In 1754 Synod adopted the findings of this committee objecting to certain proceedings, but deciding that "since Dr. Watts's version is introduced in this church, and is well adapted for Christian worship, and received by many Presbyterian congregations, both in America and Great Britain, they cannot but judge it best for the well-being of the congregation under their present circumstances, that they should be continued."¹⁵² The disturbance in New York continuing, the Synod of 1755 directed "that the Scotch version be used equally with the other."¹⁵³ This direction was not obeyed. The Synod of 1756 rebuked the majority for their adherence to Watts, but also revoked their order of the previous year; thus leaving Watts' Imitations in sole possession of the field.¹⁵⁴ The offended minority withdrew from the New York church to form "The Scotch Church", which was taken under the care of the Associate Presbytery, representing one of the secessions from the Church of Scotland.

became of excellent service and for the divine relish which in the use of them had affected many minds. During that remarkable season, many of the people became desirous of introducing some one of the New Versions of the Psalms, into the stated publick worship of the congregation; and from their knowledge and experience of their suitableness to animate and raise their own devotion, hoping this might produce the same effect on others. After this matter had been some years under consideration and by the private use of the New Version, the old Version had become every day to the Taste of many more and more flat, dull, insipid and undevotional . . . and it had been judged that no objection could arise against introducing Doctor Watts version but from ignorance of the difference between the old version and that, or from some unreasonable prejudice, the ministers, elders, deacons and trustees with the approbation of the principal part of the congregation, . . . desired that, that version might be proposed to the congregation to be introduced in a months time unless sufficient reason to the contrary should be signified to Mr. Pemberton in the mean time."

¹⁵² *Records*, p. 260.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

The introduction of the "new version" into churches newly established involved less difficulty. That at Newburyport, organized by Whitefield's supporters in 1746, used Watts' Imitations from the beginning; and they were recommended by the Presbytery of Boston as "well adapted to the New Testament Church".¹⁵⁵ Newburyport and its Presbytery were independent, but the process of church extension under the New Side Synod of New York developed some similar situations. Samuel Davies, whom the Presbytery of New Castle ordained for missionary work in Virginia, introduced there not only *The Psalms imitated* but even the *Hymns* of Watts. Two of the former were sung at the installation of John Todd over a Hanover congregation on November 12, 1752, and printed in full in connection with Davies' Installation sermon.¹⁵⁶ In 1755 he wrote from Hanover that Watts' *Psalms and Hymns* were "the system of psalmody the Dissenters use in these parts", and in the same year made requisition upon the London Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge for "a good number" of the *Psalms and Hymns* for the use of his black people. He had found there are no books they learn so soon or take such pleasure in, as they have "a kind of ecstatic delight in psalmody".¹⁵⁷ Davies' use of the *Hymns* was independent and exceptional at that date; and in connection with the writing and publication of hymns of his own composition, makes him a pioneer of Hymnody in the American Presbyterian Church.

Even on the New Side the change in the Psalmody was hesitating and gradual. The Old Side churches furnished no occasion for the Synod of Philadelphia to adjudicate on Psalmody during the whole period of the schism. When in

¹⁵⁵ H. C. Hovey, *Origin and Annals of "The Old South" in Newburyport*, Boston, 1896, p. 53.

¹⁵⁶ *A Sermon preached at the Installation of the Revd. Mr. John Todd*, Glasgow, 1754, pp. 17, 113.

¹⁵⁷ *Letters from the Rev. Mr. Davies*, 2nd ed., London, 1757, p. 12; W. H. Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, [first series], Philada., 1850, pp. 286, 289.

1763 the query already referred to as to the status of the Imitations in the reunited Church reached the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, it is plain that subsequent investigation convinced many that the Imitations could not be regarded as Psalm-versions. In the Synod of 1764 there was hot debate, and the situation was difficult between lingering Old Side scruples and the New Side precedent in the New York case. No conclusion could be reached till the Synod of 1765 compromised upon a hesitating allowance of the Imitations in these terms:

"The Synod judged it best, in present circumstances, only to declare that they look on the inspired Psalms in Scripture, to be proper matter to be sung in Divine worship, according to their original design and the practice of the Christian churches, yet will not forbid those to use the imitation of them whose judgment and inclination lead them to do so."¹⁵⁸

In the very year of this query, John Miller, by training a Congregationalist, was complained of to the Presbytery of Lewes, Delaware, for introducing Watts' Imitations into his Duck Creek charge. The Presbytery sustained him, but his other charge at Dover, continued to sing "Raus' Version" for many years.¹⁵⁹

At Philadelphia, in the Second Church, initiated by Whitefield's visit, and shepherded by Gilbert Tennent, no steps toward changing the Psalmody were ventured on till 1773. At the Whitefield Memorial Service, October 14, 1770, Watts' hymn, "A Funeral Thought", and Wesley's "Ah! lovely appearance of death", taken from Whitefield's hymn book, were sung by a company of young people,¹⁶⁰ but doubtless regarded as "anthems".¹⁶¹ On March 15, 1773, the congregation voted to introduce Watts' Imitations. So much protest was made that a second congregational meeting was held on March 22, which ratified the choice by

¹⁵⁸ *Records*, p. 345.

¹⁵⁹ S. Miller, *Life of Samuel Miller*, Phila, 1869, vol. i, p. 22.

¹⁶⁰ J. Sproat, *Discourse occasioned by the death of George Whitefield*, Phila. 1771.

¹⁶¹ The New Side Synod of N. Y. had recommended the disuse of anthems on the Lord's Day. *Records*, p. 260.

a vote of 38 for Watts, and 8 for Rous.¹⁶² The minority vainly petitioned the session to reinstate 'Rous' as the only way to restore order and peace, and appealed to the First Presbytery of Philadelphia, which refused to interfere, "As the aforesaid Psalms are used by a large Number of the Congregations within the Bounds of the Synod, and the Synod have allowed the use of them".¹⁶³ An appeal brought the matter once more before the reunited Synod. That body in 1774 declined to decide the case on its merits, on the belated plea that it had no time to consider the versions in question; but in view of earlier permissions to use the Imitations, refused "to make any order to forbid the congregation to continue the practice now begun".¹⁶⁴

Thus once more the matter of changing the Psalmody was left to the decision of the congregation concerned, and the way was officially left open both for the forbearance which Synod earnestly enjoined, and for the years of bitter parochial strife which its decision assured. Meantime, in the years preceding the Revolution, the change to Watts was effected in some parishes, and in many more the advocates of such change were steadily increasing in number. In many minds the wish for improvement in the substance of praise must have been accompanied also by a longing for its better rendering. The Presbyterian Psalmody of the time appears to have been as deplorable as that of New England before "regular" singing was introduced. The adhesion to "Rous" carried with it generally an exclusive regard for the few "common tunes" to which that version had been sung in the old country. The ability to render them with musical correctness had long been lost, and the universal practice was to have the Psalms lined out by a precentor, who might or might not know the rudiments of music. John Adams, accustomed to the New England improvements, reports that even in New York in 1774, the Psalmody of the "Old Presbyterian Society" is "in the *old*

¹⁶² Ms. minutes.

¹⁶³ Ms. minutes, May 21, 1773.

¹⁶⁴ *Records*, p. 448.

way, as we call it—all the drawling, quavering, discord in the world".¹⁶⁵ Attending the chapel at Princeton, seven days later (August 27), he notes that the scholars sing as badly as the Presbyterians at New York".¹⁶⁶ It is altogether unlikely that much better conditions prevailed in towns and settlements less accessible to observant travellers.

There had been, however, at Philadelphia a beginning of "the art of psalmody", in which many Presbyterians were concerned, and as early as 1760 a school in which it was taught.¹⁶⁷ In 1761-2 James Lyon, a Nassau-Hall graduate of 1759 and afterwards a Presbyterian clergyman, published by subscription the most elaborate book of church music that had yet appeared in the colonies:— *Urania, a choice collection of Psalm-Tunes, Anthems, and Hymns, from the most approv'd authors, with some entirely new: in two, three, and four parts: the whole peculiarly adapted to the use of churches and private families: to which are prefixed the plainest, & most necessary rules of psalmody.* By James Lyon, A.B. Among the subscribers are many connected with Nassau-Hall, and prominent Presbyterian clergy and laymen in Philadelphia and elsewhere. It was followed by *The lawfulness, excellency and advantage of instrumental musick in the public worship of God, urg'd and enforc'd from Scripture and the examples of the far greater part of Christians in all ages. Address'd to all (particularly the Presbyterians and Baptists) who have hitherto been taught to look upon the use of instrumental musick in the worship of God as unlawful.* By a Presbyterian (Philadelphia, Wm. Dunlap, 1763). This Presbyterian plea for the organ is with a view of improving the congregational singing in the Philadelphia churches, of which the writer says that "the miserable Manner in which this Part of their Worship is dron'd out, seems rather to imitate the Braying

¹⁶⁵ *Works of John Adams*, vol. ii, Boston, 1850, p. 348.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 356.

¹⁶⁷ O. G. Sonneck, *Francis Hopkinson and James Lyon*, Washington, 1905, p. 127.

of Asses, than the divine Melody so often recommended in Scripture".¹⁶⁸

But the list of subscribers prefixed to some early copies of *Urania* shows that "the art of psalmody" had attracted the attention of some influential men in the Second Church. And, from the young people's choir of 1770 already referred to, and the ensuing struggle to introduce Watts, we may infer that some beginning was soon attempted in the way of bettering church music there. But any such attempt there or elsewhere was effectually blocked by the Revolution.

In the decimated and impoverished congregations at the close of the war, Psalmody was maintained with difficulty. The complaint that the services had largely "lost even the appearance of devotion" may be explained by the religious apathy and irreverence which the Revolution left behind it. But the fact that "many" did "not join in singing the praises of God"¹⁶⁹ or give their attention to the singing in progress, is partly at least explained by the deplorable conditions to which the singing was reduced. If it was so bad musically before the war, it was certainly no better afterward. Samuel Blair at Neshaminy describes the congregations as "drolling out the tones of ill-measured dullness, or jarring with harsh discord."

¹⁶⁸ P. 19. There is a copy in The Pennsylvania Historical Society. The pamphlet appeared in April, and was so readily bought that Dunlap advertised a 2nd ed. on June 16. In the same month a burlesque 2nd ed. was advertised as published by Andrew Stuart, viz. *A Cudgell to drive the Devil out of every Christian place of Worship: Being a second edition (with necessary Improvements, which now render the sense entirely plain) of the Lawfulness, Excellency and Advantage, of Instrumental Music in the public Worship of God, but chiefly of Organs.* (Sonneck, *op. cit.*, pp. 131, 132. Hildeburn, No. 1883). "Presbyterian" states that St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, was "the only English Congregation in the Province" having an organ at that time, though the two other Episcopal churches were then raising organ funds (pp. 28, 30).

¹⁶⁹ Preface to proposed Directory for Worship, in *A Draught of the Form of The Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.*, New York, S. & J. Loudon, 1887, p. 53.

From other points of view than the musical, there was apparent need of some reconstruction of Presbyterian Psalmody. The number of those using or wishing to use Watts' Imitations and even his hymns, was always growing; but, even so, the Imitations, as they stood, contained many objectionable allusions to the British sovereign and state. On the other hand, in almost every congregation in the Scotch and Irish settlements of the South and West there was at least a determined minority resisting change. Any suggestion, on the part of the more progressive element, of Watts' superiority, was enough to turn a congregation into a debating society. Any effort to introduce Watts into public worship was to disturb and often to convulse a parish, if not indeed a larger area.

It may have been with a hope of uniting the two parties that a proposal was made to the Synod of 1785, with a view of attaining "the nearest uniformity that is practicable," that "the Synod choose out, and order some of their number to take the assistance of all the versions in our power, and compose for us a version more suitable to our circumstances and taste than any we now have".¹⁷⁰ After some debate, the proposal was carried by a small majority. The committee reported progress in 1786, and was continued.¹⁷¹ No further report from them is recorded. The minutes of the Synod of 1787 contain the bare statement: "The Synod did allow and do allow, that Dr. Watts's imitation of David's Psalms, as revised by Mr. Barlow, be sung in the churches and families under their care."¹⁷² There is nothing in the record to connect this with any previous action; but John Black, who was present, stated in a sermon at Marsh-Creek in 1790,¹⁷³ that the action was taken upon the report of the committee theretofore appointed, to the effect, that having compared such versions as they could obtain, they did not apprehend

¹⁷⁰ *Records*, pp. 513, 514.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 522. ¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 535.

¹⁷³ *The duty of Christians, in singing the praise of God, explained. A Sermon.* By John Black. Carlisle, Kline & Reynolds, 1790, p. 46.

any so well calculated for christian worship, as that of Dr. Watts, as amended by Mr. Barlow of New England". He adds that *Barlow's Watts* "was then laid before Synod for their consideration, who, after mature deliberation, gave it their judicial sanction".

But the unexpected part of Mr. Black's testimony is what follows, to the effect that "the committee had also added a book of hymns to this version; but it was laid aside; not because Synod disapproved of the thing in itself, but because some parts of the collection seemed to them exceptionable". There is no reason to question his testimony as to the proposed book, and his interpretation of the mind of the Synod is confirmed by the fact that its committee to prepare a new *Directory for Worship* embodied Hymn singing in their draught of their Directory printed in that same year. That the Synod in 1787 was already prepared to examine a specific hymn book on its merits goes far to explain why Hymn singing slipped into the written constitution of the Church with so little debate or even notice. Even so, two questions remain to puzzle us. First: if any hymns were considered in 1787, why not Watts' *Hymns*, which were not "exceptionable", had become dear to many, and were beginning to find their way into churches, without authorization? Second: what was the "book of hymns" added by the committee? It would seem probable that it was the appendix of seventy hymns (mostly from Watts; a few of his own), which Barlow added to his revision of Watts' *Imitations* as presented to, and adopted by, the General Association of Connecticut. Nevertheless surviving copies of one of the first issues of *Barlow's Watts* containing the certificate of its authorization by Synod, and printed at Philadelphia in 1787 by Francis Bailey, have, bound in with the Psalms, and without a separate title, a collection of 139 hymns, whose presence in that connection has not been explained. The collection is of unusual excellence and variety for that time, being brightened by lyrics of both the Wesley brothers, Miss Steele and others later than Watts. In view of the fact that

such men of culture as Dr. Ewing, Dr. Robert Davidson, and Dr. Alison, were on the committee, it remains as an interesting possibility that this collection is the first tentative hymn book of American Presbyterianism.

The approval of *Barlow's Watts* by the Synod of 1787 involved no change of attitude, except that it gave finality to a position which heretofore might seem to be held tentatively. Synod's action was taken in full view of the controversy then raging in the South and West between the partisans of "Rous" and those of Watts, in the presence indeed of representatives of both sides from the disturbed Presbytery of Abingdon.¹⁷⁴ The pleas of neither side moved Synod from its position:—it would not commit the Church to any type of Psalmody; it had already approved both "Rous" and Watts for use in worship, and approved both still; any question as to which should be preferred in any given case was a parochial issue, to be handled forbearingly no doubt, but not to be brought before Synod.¹⁷⁵

The issue between "Rous" and Watts was thenceforward, then, merely a parochial issue. But, in the years following, the aggregate of parishes affected by it was so great, and the consequences so serious, as to make these years of controversy something like a distinct era in the history of the Presbyterian Church.

In Virginia the issue was definitely framed in a fruitless appeal to the Presbytery of Hanover to discipline the Rev. Charles Cummings for abetting the use of Watts. But Mr. Cummings was forced out of his charges by the uneasiness of his people; and the atmosphere of party feeling is revealed by the inquiry from some in various congregations to Presbytery in 1784, as to whether they would be endangered by attending upon the Word preached by Mr. Cummings.¹⁷⁶ In Tennessee the Psalmody question played a principal part in the tumultuous disorders in the newly formed Presbytery of

¹⁷⁴ *Records*, p. 515.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 537.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. W. H. Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, second series, 2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1856, pp. 124, 125.

Abingdon, which came before the Synod of 1787. In the North Carolina settlements every proposal to introduce Watts bred trouble. At New Providence the use of his Imitations for one Sunday by a pulpit supply (William C. Davis) started the suspicion that the pastor (James Wallis) had connived with him, and permanently disrupted the church, the minority forming a separate congregation.¹⁷⁷ At Poplar Tent, where, about 1785, Mr. Archibald, the pastor, determined to introduce Watts upon his own authority, some of the Rous party left and some stayed to interrupt the worship.¹⁷⁸ The result of the controversy in North Carolina was a permanent schism; those favoring a strict Psalmody withdrawing to form an Associate Presbytery.

The fiercest heat attained in the controversy, and the greatest devastation it left behind, were in its new settlements of Kentucky. Elsewhere the 'Rous' advocates might be regarded as acting on the defensive, but in Kentucky their cause found an aggressive champion in the person of the Rev. Adam Rankin, who came to Lexington in 1784. He sincerely thought he heard a divine call to purge the Church of the taint in its Congregational Song, and his enthusiasm for the exclusive use of Psalms not only possessed his mind but perverted it. When he found in 1785, at the Cane Run conference of the young churches, that his associates were not in sympathy with him nor anxious to agitate a vexed question, he at once entered upon a campaign of fierce and bitter polemic, in the role of a prophet hurling epithets upon his opposers. Censured by Presbytery for traducing his brethren and barring the singers of Watts from the Communion, and suspended for contumacy, he and his supporters withdrew to form what came to be called "the Rankinite Schism," composed of twelve congregations, whose fortunes we need not follow.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ W. H. Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina*, New York, 1846, p. 249.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 442.

¹⁷⁹ For the "Rankin Schism" see R. Davidson, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*, New York, 1847, chap. 3, and "Origin of the Rankinites" in *Evangelical Record*, Lexington, vol. ii, Sept. 1813.

The Rankin polemics and schism threw a blight upon Kentucky Presbyterianism from which few if any congregations escaped. The spirit of dissension was kept alive for years, and in many places Psalmody became the main issue and concern of religion. Internal feuds prevented attention to the inroads of vice and infidelity, and the high promise of Presbyterianism lapsed into spiritual and material decline.

In Pennsylvania, East and West, the ground was laid for the fire of controversy, but the change to the new Psalmody was made with less disturbance, because more gradually and with more of the spirit of mutual concession. In Philadelphia the change was effected in the Third Church unanimously in 1788.¹⁸⁰ In the West the Presbytery of Redstone, through its entire career, kept its records clear of any allusion to the Psalmody controversy. Watts' *Imitations*, and afterwards his *Hymns*, found their way into the churches through the homes, and frequently were used at first in rotation with "Rous".¹⁸¹ In some churches, even the use of the *Imitations* was postponed, as in the First Church of Carlisle, until well into the XIXth century.¹⁸²

The real issue in the "Rous"-Watts controversy was not between a literal or a freer Psalmody, but between an Old Testament Psalmody and an evangelical Hymnody. That issue once decided, it remained for the Church to embody its convictions and practice in the constitution then being framed. This was effected by Synodical adoption of *The Directory for the worship of God, of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, on May 16, 1788. Unlike some other parts of the draught reported by the committee of 1787, its chapter "Of the Singing of Psalms" was adopted intact. The title of the chapter is still that of the corresponding chapter of the *Westminster Directory* of 1644.

¹⁸⁰ J. W. Scott, *An Historical Sketch of the Pine Street, or Third Pres. Church*, Philadelphia, 1837, p. 31.

¹⁸¹ Jos. Smith, *Old Redstone*, Philadelphia, 1854, p. 290.

¹⁸² C. P. Wing, *History of the First Pres. Ch. of Carlisle*, Carlisle, 1877, p. 167. Watts was not used till 1824.

but where the opening sentence of the original had declared "the duty of Christians to praise God publicly by singing of Psalms", the new Directory asserts that such duty is to be fulfilled "by singing psalms or hymns". The other changes deal with the propriety of cultivating a knowledge of music, of giving up the practice of lining, and of devoting more time to "this excellent part of divine service" than was usual.

The cultivation of music thus enjoined began at once in some churches, in others had already begun under the numerous "Instructors of Psalmody" raised up under the impulse imparted by Billings, especially Andrew Law of Connecticut. These teachers went from place to place, establishing "Psalmody classes". In the region around Philadelphia, the Presbyterian churches shared in a general¹⁸³ movement to improve sacred music, under the leadership of Andrew Adgate. He founded there in 1784 an "Institution for Promoting the Knowledge of Psalmody", afterwards the "Uranian Acadmy".¹⁸⁴ In 1787 he was preparing to establish "an Institution for Cultivating Church Music free to all."¹⁸⁵ Samuel Blair paid tribute to his benevolence, assiduity and success, and rejoiced in the great improvement he had effected, saying that "Public worship hath assumed, comparatively, a celestial grace; and the temples of religion, . . . now resound with vibrations of well-ordered and commanding melody."¹⁸⁶ Mr. Blair's wish that Adgate's "important services" may continue with the encouragement of all denominations¹⁸⁷ was thwarted by his falling a victim

¹⁸³ Saml. Blair, *Discourse* (1789), p. 25, note.

¹⁸⁴ Sonneck, *op. cit.*, pp. 183, 184.

¹⁸⁵ Preface to his *Psalms and Hymns*.

¹⁸⁶ *A Discourse on Psalmody. Delivered by the Rev. Samuel Blair, in the Presbyterian Church in Neshaminy, at a public concert, given by Mr. Spicer, Master in sacred music: under the superintendency of Mr. Erwin, Pastor of that Church* (Philadelphia, John McColloch, 1789). This scarce pamphlet is the principal evidence of the Presbyterian participation in the Adgate movement, and was published "to enliven and diffuse the spirit of improvement in Psalmody" (preface).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25, note.

to the yellow fever epidemic of 1793, while serving on the Committee of Alleviation.¹⁸⁸

This movement to improve singing was inevitably a movement toward the use of Watts or of other hymns. The monotony of metre and rude rhythms of "Rous' version" would not serve the purpose of the "masters in sacred music." That is why, in so many parish records, the giving up of lining and the adoption of Watts are recorded as a single entry.¹⁸⁹ Copies have survived of *Select Psalms and Hymns for the use of Mr. Adgate's Pupils: and proper for all singing-schools. Philadelphia: Printed at the Uranian Press, by Young and M'Culloch, Corner of Chestnut & Second Street. MDCCLXXXVII.* The forty hymns were chosen from Watts, Wesley, Steele and others, aiming at metrical variety. Adgate and his colleague, "Mr. Spicer", had also their own music books: the *Uranian Instructions* of 1787, *Rudiments of Music* (1788), *Selection of Sacred Harmony* (1788), *Philadelphia Harmony* (1788); all originally Adgate's, and sometimes, in later editions, carried forward by Spicer. *The Art of Singing*, and other works of Andrew Law, also played a considerable part in the improvement of Presbyterian singing.

No immediate steps were taken by the General Assembly in providing the hymns to be sung under the new *Directory*. In the minds of many, "Hymns" and "Watts" were synonymous. The use of the *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* was not formally authorized until 1802; but at least as early as 1788 editions of *Barlow's Watts*, bearing the clerk's certificate of Synod's authorization, appeared with the *Hymns* bound in. Evidently some churches did not await their authorization. Watts' *Hymns* may be called the first hymn book of American Presbyterianism, disregarding the proposed book of 1787. The second was an independent local venture, with two title pages: *A Version of the Book of Psalms, selected from the most approved versions. . . . Approved of by the*

¹⁸⁸ *Minutes of the Committee*, Philadelphia, 1848, pp. 45, 200.

¹⁸⁹ E. g. in the Third Church of Philadelphia, Sept 29, 1788.

Presbytery of Charleston. A Collection of Hymns for public and private worship. Approved of by the Presbytery of Charleston. (both) Charleston, Printed by J. McIver, No. 47, Bay, MDCCXCVI. This book was prepared by Dr. George Buist of Charleston, with the advice of Dr. Hugh Blair.¹⁹⁰ The hymns are from many sources, including the English Arian hymn books, and with a preference for the Scottish *Paraphrases*. The book was used by the Presbyterian churches in the city and neighborhood of Charleston until at least 1809.¹⁹¹

What must be regarded as the third Presbyterian hymn book was the small collection annexed by President Dwight to his revision of Watts' *Imitations* for the Connecticut Association, to take the place of Barlow's; inasmuch as these hymns were specifically allowed by the General Assembly of 1802, in connection with the revised Psalms, and at the same time as the allowance of Watts' *Hymns*.¹⁹² The Assembly had cooperated in securing Dwight's revision of the *Imitations*, as it had cooperated with other projects of the Connecticut Association; but apparently without sharing the prejudice aroused by Barlow and without much interest in the results of Dr. Dwight's labors. And in the end it appears to have been satisfied that churches under Connecticut influence, or which preferred Dwight to Barlow, should make use both of his revised *Imitations* and his collection of hymns.¹⁹³

The great body of the Church had no apparent desire for a hymn book of their own. As early as 1796 the Assembly was overtured to appoint a committee to compile one, but the proposal was allowed to lie on the table.¹⁹⁴ In 1817 the Presbytery of Philadelphia sent up to the Assembly for its

¹⁹⁰ Preface.

¹⁹¹ *Sermons by the Reverend George Buist, D.D.*, New York, 1809, vol. i, pp. 311, 312, note.

¹⁹² *Minutes 1789-1820*, p. 249.

¹⁹³ On this subject see the writer's "The American Revisions of Watts's Psalms", already cited, pp. 25-26.

¹⁹⁴ *Minutes, ut supra*, p. 116.

approbation "a copy of a collection of Hymns, intended for the use of society meetings; the Presbytery having declined to express their opinion of the book, thinking it proper that it should be submitted to the Assembly".¹⁹⁵ This was presumably *Hymns for social worship, collected from various authors* (Philadelphia, W. W. Woodward, 1817), the work of James P. Wilson, pastor of the First Church of Philadelphia. It contained 181 hymns, and in intent and contents ranges with the "Supplements to Watts". After reference to a committee, the consideration of the book was indefinitely postponed.¹⁹⁶ No further attempt was made to prepare a hymn book for the special use of the Church till the proceedings that culminated in the *Psalms and Hymns* of 1831.

In recognizing Hymn singing in its constitution the Church was far from the intention of cutting itself off from Psalm singing. It approved, rather, Dr. Watts' System of Praise as a whole, with its two departments of Psalms and Hymns. Nor did the desire for an evangelical Hymnody among the people imply dissatisfaction with Watts' Imitations. Probably no parish introduced his *Hymns* apart from the Psalms: some had them bound up with Barlow's Revision from the first: many remained satisfied with the revised Psalms alone. The use of *Barlow's Watts* became so widespread as to make it the characteristic Praise Book of Presbyterianism, and the addition to it of the *Hymns* became a more and more common practice till toward the end of the first quarter of the XIXth century, when it may be regarded as practically universal. Hindered as it was by the Scottish predilection for an Old Testament Psalmody, the Presbyterian Church was slower than some others in attaining the full measure of Dr. Watts' System of Praise, but perhaps in no Church did his ascendancy become more complete. It was a result so belated that, when viewed in connection with the progress of English Hymnody as a whole, it seems like a step backward. A full century had passed since the first

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 641. ¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 667.

appearance of Watts' *Hymns*. The area of Hymnody had been widened permanently under the Evangelical Revival, and its contents greatly enriched not only by fresh hymns but by new types of hymns. During the first quarter of the XIXth century the only apparent contact of the Presbyterian Church with this newer Hymnody was through the proffer of Dr. Wilson's little book of 1817;¹⁹⁷ its only dealing with it was to "postpone indefinitely".

4. THE BAPTISTS.

If the earliest New England Baptists practised Psalm singing at all, they probably, like their neighbors, lined the Psalms out of the *Bay Psalm Book*. But the Baptist immigrants had come out of the heated atmosphere of the "controversy concerning singing", and many of them during the years when persecution had favored the habit of not singing, lest attention be attracted to the meetings.

The First Church of Boston introduced singing before 1728, and lined the Psalms until 1759;¹⁹⁸ the Newport church during the short pastorate of John Comer, beginning in 1726.¹⁹⁹ In the First Church of Providence there was no singing till the coming of President Manning in 1771. Even then its introduction was only accomplished by allowing the women to vote for it, and caused a division.²⁰⁰

In the Middle Colonies and to some extent in the Southern, the introduction of singing into Baptist churches was effected through the influence of a body of Welsh Baptists settled on the Welsh Tract in Delaware.²⁰¹ They adopted in 1716 an English Confession of Faith of 1689, but with

¹⁹⁷ Even Dr. Wilson did not know that his 176th hymn, "Jesus! lover of my soul", was by one of the Wesleys.

¹⁹⁸ N. E. Wood, *History of the First Baptist Church of Boston*, Philadelphia, 1899, pp. 220, 243.

¹⁹⁹ A. H. Newman, *History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, ed. Philada., 1898, p. 115.

²⁰⁰ R. A. Guild, *History of Brown University*, Boston, 1867, pp. 207-210.

²⁰¹ Morgan Edwards, *Materials toward a history of the Baptists in Delaware State*, in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, vol. ix, p. 52.

the addition of two articles from a confession published by Benjamin Keach and his son Elias in 1697, one being on the duty "Of Singing Psalms, &c".²⁰² The increase of immigration soon made Philadelphia a Baptist centre, and in 1742 the Philadelphia Association ordered the printing of a new edition of the Confession of 1689 as their own,²⁰³ with the insertion of two articles, one on the singing of Psalms,²⁰⁴ the other on laying on of hands upon baptized believers. These articles, thus incorporated in their doctrinal statement, proved to be identical with those of Keach adopted by the church on the Welsh Tract in 1716.²⁰⁵

The *Bay Psalm Book* was probably in use in and around Philadelphia as well as in New England. In Boston the First Church changed to *Tate and Brady* in 1740, "so long as no objections should be offered against it".²⁰⁶ the Baldwin Place Church sang *Tate and Brady* till about 1770.²⁰⁷ And it may be that some Baptist demand in and around Philadelphia helped to encourage Franklin to reprint that version in 1733.

In America as in England Baptists were not greatly concerned to preserve a strict Psalmody, owing partly to the desire for sacramental hymns. When the "controversy concerning singing" was disposed of, the introduction of hymns hardly raised an issue.

There is no doubt that the Baptist impulse toward Hymn singing was largely derived from Watts, and that in many churches his were the first hymns sung. Franklin's reprints

²⁰² W. J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, Philadelphia [1911], p. 294.

²⁰³ *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1707-1807*, Philada., 1851, p. 46.

²⁰⁴ "Singing psalms met with some opposition, especially at Cohansey:" Morgan Edwards, *ut supra*.

²⁰⁵ *A Confession of Faith . . . Adopted by the Baptist Association met at Philadelphia, Sept. 25, 1742. . . To which are added, Two Articles viz. Of Imposition of Hands, and Singing of Psalms in Publick Worship*: Philadelphia, B. Franklin, 1743; often reprinted.

²⁰⁶ N. E. Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

²⁰⁷ D. C. Eddy, *Memorial Sermon*, Boston, 1865, p. 30.

of the *Psalms imitated* in 1741 and of the *Hymns* in 1742 were probably used in some of them about Philadelphia. In Boston, *Tate and Brady* was replaced by Watts' *Psalms and Hymns* soon after 1770 in the Baldwin Place Church,²⁰⁸ and in 1771 in the First Church.²⁰⁹ Their adoption became very widespread, and they rooted themselves deep in the hearts of a great body of Baptists. But several considerations tended to impede to some extent the ascendancy of Watts in American Baptist Hymnody.

There was, first, *the tendency to establish a denominational Hymnody*, especially to supply hymns suitable to "believer's baptism". Morgan Edwards has preserved the hymn that had been used at the "Baptisterion" on the banks of the Schuylkill, just beyond Philadelphia.²¹⁰ The earliest American Baptist hymn book, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs, collected from the works of several authors* (Newport, 1766), opens with sixteen hymns on Baptism. And so, in 1808, after the appearance of many books, the anonymous *The Boston Collection of sacred and devotional Hymns* "was compiled principally with a view to accommodate the Baptist Churches of Boston and its vicinity, who have long desired such a collection, for the purpose of singing at the administration of" Baptism.

From the first, however, the desire of many went beyond baptismal hymns. They wanted Baptist hymn books, that should make available the new store of hymns, Baptist and other, written since Watts' time and made current in English collections; and many were moved to contribute hymns of their own composition. The independent and individualistic spirit combined with denominational insistence, that has always characterized Baptists, developed and has maintained a striking proclivity toward the multiplication of hymn books. The great array of these tends to obscure the actual extent of the use of Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*.

²⁰⁸ D. C. Eddy, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

²⁰⁹ N. E. Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

²¹⁰ *Materials towards a history of the Baptists in Pennsylvania*, vol. 1, Philada. J. Cruikshank, 1770, pp. 131, 132.

The Newport book was followed by two at Philadelphia: *A choice Collection of Hymns, in which are some never before printed. Philadelphia: Printed in the year 1782*,²¹¹ and *A choice Collection of Hymns, from various authors, adapted to publick worship: designed for the edification of the pious of all denominations; but more particularly for the use of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia* (Enoch Story, 1784). Both of these appear to have been prepared for his following of "Universal Baptists" by Elhanan Winchester, after his exclusion from the pulpit of the First Baptist Church. The latter is said to have been used in the Church of the German Baptist Brethren (Dunkers), already formed at Germantown.²¹² It certainly furnished much of the materials of the Brethren's first English hymn book, *The Christians Duty, exhibited, in a series of Hymns . . . Recommended to the serious of all Denominations. By the Fraternity of Baptist's. The first edition. Germantown, printed by Peter Leibert, 1791*.²¹³

In 1788 the Philadelphia Association determined to have an official book for the associated churches.²¹⁴ It appeared as *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, done under the appointment of the Philadelphian Association. By Samuel Jones, D.D. and Burgis Allison, A.M.* (Philadelphia, R. Aitken & Son, 1790: 2nd ed., 1801; 4th, 1819). The Psalms were all from Watts: most of the hymns from Rippon's *Selection* (London, 1786) and one "printed in London, 1774"; apparently Conyers'. The book was highly regarded within and beyond the Association. *Hymns on different spiritual subjects* (Norwich, 1792) by Benjamin Cleveland,²¹⁵ as also the later *Hymns and Spiritual Songs on various subjects. By the Rev. Ebenezer Jayne* (Morristown,

²¹¹ Not in Hildeburn's *Issues of the Pennsylvania Press*. The writer's copy is recorded by Evans.

²¹² Ms. note in the writer's copy.

²¹³ 2nd ed., 1801; 3rd, 1813; 4th, 1825; *Supplement*, 1816; 2nd ed., 1825.

²¹⁴ *Minutes*, p. 239.

²¹⁵ Cf. H. S. Burrage, *Baptist Hymn Writers and their Hymns*, Portland, Me., n. d., pp. 223, 641.

1809), were offerings of original contributions, of which Cleveland's hymn, "Oh, could I find from day to day", alone survived.

It is likely that many of the Baptist hymn books were not intended to replace Watts in church worship: a number bore on their title-pages the assurance that they were only supplements to his *Psalms and Hymns*. Of these the most popular, here as in England, was Rippon's *Selection*. Two reprints of it appeared in 1792, at New York and Elizabeth, and were followed by others. William Parkinson, of the First Church in New York, published in 1809 *A Selection of Hymns and Spiritual Songs . . . as an Appendix to Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns*, which, he says in his preface "in most congregations of Christians are constantly used". William Collier's *A new Selection of Hymns* (Boston, 1812), was also a supplement to Watts. That such books were actually used in connection with Watts appears from the publication of Daniel Dodge's *A Selection of Hymns and Psalms* (Wilmington, 1808), an effort to combine the best from Watts and Rippon for the convenience of those who found it burdensome to carry both books to church, but could not agree to dispense with either; "some being passionately fond of one and some of the other".

A second consideration tending to impede the ascendancy of Watts was *the preference of a considerable proportion of Baptist people for songs of a lower literary grade*. The strength of the Church was among the uncultured; its extension was by means of evangelistic methods. "The mass of the Baptists were indifferent or hostile to ministerial education." They craved highly emotional preaching and songs of the same type in free rhythms that could be sung to popular melodies with choruses.

This showed itself as early as 1784²¹⁶ in the *Divine Hymns, or Spiritual Songs* of Joshua Smith, a New Hampshire layman, and others, which gave currency to the hymn on "Christ the apple-tree", and made odd additions to other

²¹⁶ Brinley catalogue, lot 6038.

hymns. This book in varying forms²¹⁷ was very popular. its 1803 edition was the first hymn book used in the First Church of Portland, Maine.²¹⁸ "Spiritual songs" appeared in most Baptist hymn books, and were sung also without book. "This kind of composition," says Mr. Parkinson in 1809, "has, for several years past been greatly abused—Songs have been circulated, not only in Ms. but also in print, which have been so barbarous in language, so unequal in numbers, and so defective in rhyme, as to excite disgust in all persons even of tolerable understanding in these things; what is infinitely worse, so extremely unsound in doctrine, that no discerning Christian can sing or hear them without pain." Believing that "many of them, notwithstanding, contain valuable ideas," Mr. Parkinson aimed to "lessen the use of several hymn books now in common circulation" by furnishing "those who choose to make use of them with a greater variety and more correct edition of what are called *Spiritual Songs* than they now possess."²¹⁹ We may judge existing conditions by the character of some of the 170 songs appended to Parkinson's *Selection* with a view of ameliorating them. Of the first, each verse carries the refrain:—

"Then be entreated now to stop,
For unless you warning take,
Ere you are aware you'll drop
Into the burning lake."

The fifth is entitled "Miss Hataway's Experience" and includes her conversation with "an uncle from whom she had large expectations".

Parkinson's *Selection* had reached a third edition in 1817, and Southern Baptists had called for three editions of Jesse Mercer's *The Cluster of Spiritual Songs, Divine Hymns and Social Poems: being chiefly a collection*.

By this time the new zeal for missions was developing a demand for an educated ministry, and drawing a sharp line

²¹⁷ For some of the known editions, see W. DeL. Love, *Samson Occum*, Boston, n. d., p. 180, note.

²¹⁸ Burrage, *op. cit.*, p. 643.

²¹⁹ Preface to Parkinson's *Selection*, 1809.

of cleavage between its advocates and the "anti-effort" Baptists. In the Hymnody the line was not so sharply drawn, but as a rule the less educated congregations, especially in the South, carried forward the use of "Spiritual Songs". An especial favorite was Starke Dupuy's *Hymns and Spiritual Songs, selected and original*, Louisville, c. 1818 (22nd ed., 1841; revised by J. M. Peck, 1843), emotional and often illiterate. Even in New England David Benedict's *The Pawtucket Collection of Conference Hymns* (1817) reached an eighth edition (1843). In Virginia Andrew Broadus published in 1828 his *Dover Selection of Spiritual Songs* by recommendation of the Dover Association, but in his better *Virginia Selection* of 1836 the "spiritual song" element is apologized for as an allowance made for "popular liking". William Dossey's *The Choice; in two parts* (3rd ed., 1830) was largely used in the South, and included over a hundred of his own hymns.

There were, on the other hand, many Baptist churches which had yielded very partially or not at all to "popular liking", and had never given up the use of Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*. But their pastors had required hymns to supplement Watts, and the people complained of the inconvenience of using more than one book and the difficulty of finding the hymns as given out. This led to something like a concerted effort to conserve the better type of Baptist Hymnody. James M. Winchell, who had developed congregational song in his First Church of Boston,²²⁰ published there in 1818 *An arrangement of the Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs of . . . Watts, to which are added, indexes . . . to facilitate the use of the whole . . .*, with which was bound up *A Selection of more than three hundred Hymns, from the most approved authors* (1819). "Winchell's Watts" attained, and for many years held, in New England a use so wide that it has been described as "universal".²²¹ In

²²⁰ Cf. R. H. Neale, *Address at 200th Anniversary of First Baptist Church*, Boston, 1865, p. 38.

²²¹ Neale, *ut supra*.

1820 the same office was performed for the churches centering at Philadelphia by *The Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, arranged by Dr. Rippon; with Dr. Rippon's Selection in one volume*. An improved edition appeared in 1827, and was commended to the churches by a large number of ministers as the best hymn book "in use among Christians".²²² In the copies of this edition a portrait of Dr. Watts was not unfitly prefixed.

LOUIS F. BENSON.

Philadelphia.

[*To be concluded.*]

²²² Cf. "recommendations" preserved in Sommers and Dagg's ed., Phila., D. Clark, 1838.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

THE BROSS LECTURES. 1911. THE SOURCES OF RELIGIOUS INSIGHT. Lectures delivered before Lake Forest College on the Foundation of the late William Bross. By Josiah Royce, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy in Harvard University. 8vo; pp. 16, 297. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912.

In these lectures Professor Royce discusses in a characteristically direct and lucid style "the ways in which religious truth can become accessible to men." By "insight" he means "knowledge that is intimate and personal and that involves a wide survey of the unity of many things." The essential feature of religion he takes to be "interest in salvation". Salvation he understands to presuppose that "there is some end or aim of human life which is more important than all other aims, and that man as he now is, or as he naturally is, is in great danger of missing this highest aim." What, therefore, he essays is to set forth the sources of such knowledge as is real insight into the way of salvation from so missing *the* aim of life as to render it a failure.

These sources of "religious insight" are seven: individual experience, which can "show us, in its moments of wider vision, our ideal, and its times of despair, of aspiration, or of self-examination, our need;" social experience, which, "in its religious aspects, helps the individual to win the wider outlook, and helps him also to find his way out of the loneliness of guilt and of failure toward wholeness of life, and promises salvation through love"; the reason, which "enables us to see life steadily and see it whole," and so reveals the divine wisdom; the will, which in its strivings brings us into touch with the divine will; the loyal spirit, which makes known to us "how the divine will may be done on earth as it is in heaven;" sorrow, which may show us "how in our loyalty and in our courage, we are becoming one with the master of life, who through sorrow overcomes"; "the unity of the Spirit" as expressed and illustrated in the invisible church, "in the working of whose Spirit in our spirit arise "the sources of insight" that have just been named.

In these lectures Prof. Royce has said much that is valuable and for which we thank him heartily. His statement of "the religious paradox" is as striking as it is true. "The paradox is that a being who is so ignorant of his duty and of his destiny as to need guidance at every point, so weak as to need saving, should still hope, in his fallible experience, to get into touch with anything divine." It can be only be-

cause of "the witness of the divine Spirit within him;" and Prof. Royce is right in claiming that no "external revelation" could enlighten us with regard to God, if there were not an inner "light that lighteneth every man coming into the world." Equally satisfactory is he when he takes issue with Prof. James; and while showing how much truth there is in pragmatism, refutes its fatal error. Indeed, it is difficult to see how his establishment of the absoluteness of truth as opposed to its relativity could be strengthened. Probably the finest lecture of the seven is that on "The Office of the Reason." In this he sets forth the "concrete" and positive nature of the reason, he illustrates its "synthetic use", he shows its fruitfulness as a source of religious insight, and he develops and explains and justifies that philosophical idealism of which he is, we suppose, the ablest living exponent. One can scarcely read his clear and logical presentation and not agree with his conclusion: "If we err, we simply come short of the insight to which we are aiming to conform, and in the light of which our ideas get absolutely all their meaning. In every error, in every blunder, in all our darkness, in all our ignorance, we are still in touch with the eternal insight. We are always seeking to know even as we are known." In a word, even false thinking demonstrates God.

And yet it is just at this point where we agree so truly that we find ourselves compelled to dissent emphatically. We have never felt that Prof. Royce's idealism could clear itself of pantheism, and still less do we feel so now. His statement "that the eternal is real, not apart from time and from our lives, but in and through and above all our individual lives" does not satisfy us. The eternal God is in and through and above all our individual lives, and he does "work in each one of us the willing and the doing according to his own good pleasures;" but he is also real before and apart from time, and apart from and independently of our individual lives. We live in him and he lives in us: and yet before we were he was; and he would be all glorious and all-sufficient now, though we and the whole creation were not. A further and serious defect in Prof. Royce's discussion is the emphasis which he puts on loyalty as the chief source of religious insight. In so doing he lays himself open, as it seems to us, to the charge of inconsistency. It will be remembered that he has established the absoluteness of truth, and also that religious insight has specially to do with truth. How, then, may he take the position, that "genuine religion" is independent of religious belief; that in so far as he is sincere or loyal, "the robber or the pirate may be a genuinely religious man;" and that "very vast ranges of the higher religious life of mankind have grown and flourished outside of the influence of Christianity." In particular, how can he hold this last view when it is precisely with reference to the way of salvation that he conceives of religion, and when Christianity's most positive claim is, as is true also of several other religions, that she is the only way of salvation?

Probably, however, the fatal defect of this whole discussion is its

utter ignoring of "external revelation" as a source of "religious insight." This is neither excused nor explained by the statement already alluded to with approval, that, without the sources of religious insight that have been set forth and that express "the witness of the spirit within us, no "external revelation", however miraculous, would avail. This is true, but it is not the point. We could not see without eyes; and yet with the best of eyes we should see nothing, if the world were not presented to our eyes. Precisely so, we do not minimize the necessity of the natural witness of the Spirit of God within every man, when we insist that no man could adequately know God, if God had not "at sundry times and in divers manners spoken in times past unto the fathers by the prophets," and "had not in these last days spoken unto us by his Son," and had not accompanied and attested these external revelations with "signs and wonders and mighty deeds" so manifestly not of nature as to stamp those who wrought them as ministers of a supernatural message. Indeed, there is but one way to dispense with and so ignore the external revelation of God; and that way is the one which Prof. Royce undoubtedly adopts. Man needs no external revelation of God; for he sees God adequately in himself, as he himself is God. This, however, is the very point at issue when the "sources of religious insight" are under discussion. Hence, admirable though Prof. Royce's discussion is in many respects, we are forced to say of it that it has missed the point.

It occurs to us to ask as we close, and we do so with great diffidence, Do these lectures fulfil the object of the donor of the Bross Foundation? That object was, "to call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world to illustrate from science, or from any department of knowledge, and to demonstrate the divine origin and the authority of the Christian Scripture."

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY.

DIE BEDEUTUNG DER GESCHICHTLICHKEIT JESU FÜR DEN GLAUBEN, von ERNST TROELTSCH, Dr. phil. et theol. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1911. 8vo; pp. 51.

Troeltsch's chief merit as a writer on theological themes lies in his straight-forward downrightness. Among the sentimentally inconsistent naturalists which crowd the ranks of "modern" theologians, he shines forth as the consistent naturalist, who will have nothing to do with half-measures. In the Lecture which at present lies before us there is, however, a greater appearance of "halfness" than is customary with him. He is clear that religion is a natural phenomenon; and that Christianity as truly as any other religion is a natural phenomenon. He sees no reason why in the natural development of human life and culture Christianity may not be transcended, and a different religion take its place. He, therefore, will not affirm the "eternity" of Christianity.

But he sees no immediate prospect of the replacement of Christianity by a new religion. He is sure that Christianity is so related to the culture of the Mediterranean basin that so long as that culture endures, so long will Christianity endure. And he writes to show that the historicity of Jesus is essential to Christianity. Thus the thesis of his Lecture is the indispensableness of the historicity of Jesus for faith. And yet, he will not admit that this indispensableness is absolute. What is indispensableness for faith now may cease to be indispensable hereafter. Who knows whether the culture of the Mediterranean basin is the ultimate culture? Who, then, can know whether the religion which is bound up with the culture of the Mediterranean basin is the ultimate religion? Meanwhile we know that for the culture of the Mediterranean basin Christianity is the only possible religion; and that for Christianity the historicity of Jesus is indispensable. This is the ground on which Troeltsch stands.

The Christianity which, in Troeltsch's view, is the only possible religious expression of the culture which has been developed in the Mediterranean basin, and to which he wishes to show that the historicity of Jesus is indispensable is, of course, not historical, or, as it is more willingly called in some quarters, "traditional" Christianity. For any Christianity the object of whose faith is a divine Christ, and the center of whose gospel is the saving work of this divine Christ "propitiating God and thus freeing men from the consequences of their infection by original sin", to raise question of the historicity of Jesus by whom this redemption has been wrought, were nonsense. "From this standpoint the raising of this question would be nothing else than to display the death-certificate of the whole of Christianity" (p. 5). The same is true of those "mixed forms" which "share the fundamental change which the Christianity of the modern world has suffered,—the transmutation of the real miracle of redemption wrought out in a historical act, into an ever new redemption through the knowledge of God"—but who "connect this redeeming faith-knowledge with the knowledge and recollection of the historical personality of Jesus, which here comes into consideration, however, with respect to neither its miracles, nor its separate declarations, but the total effect of the religious personality" (p. 11). "This", continues Troeltsch, "is the view, founded by the later, ecclesiastical Schleiermacher, which has been presented with most emphasis by Ritschl and Herrmann. For Schleiermacher, it is the suggestive power of the personality, which, working on through the mediator of His community, and conspicuous in the portrait of the Gospels, conquers the religious inefficacy, unconquerable everywhere outside the sphere of Jesus' influence, and creates the might, certitude, joy and permanence of the knowledge of God. What apart from the faith-creating influence of Christ remains mere idea and presentiment, becomes by means of this personal influence continued in the community victorious and effective force. With Ritschl, the same idea is referred less to the suggestive power of the personality than to the authority of Jesus,

producing assurance of the forgiveness of sins. Christ by this authority makes Himself Lord and King of the Kingdom of God, or of the Kingdom of God-trusting capacity of life, and it is by the knowledge of Him mediated by the community that there comes the assurance without which sinful man dared not, and may not dare, to believe in God's sin-pardoning grace. With Herrmann the humiliating and exalting fact of the personality of Christ is a historical reality which only the evil and impenitent will can deny, just as it is only the believing will, yearning after God and convicted of its sin, that sees it. It is this fact alone that gives the courage to believe in God as sin-pardoning grace, and with it, the bright delight in and power to all the goods conformable to conscience, while he who cannot become sure of this fact of God falls into doubt, or soothes himself in scepticism and loses the habit of religious needs. It is clear that in all these cases, Christianity is a thought of God, an idea, a faith-knowledge of the true nature of things. All notion of a historical redemptive miracle happening once, and of the foundation of an institute of grace carrying it on, is lacking. But the idea is still, in its efficiency, bound to the historical personality of Christ, by which alone power or certitude is lent it, and the idea so strengthened made the property of a community united in the recollection of Christ. The presupposition for such a mode of thought, besides the silent assumption of the knowableness of the religious personality of Jesus and its effectiveness by means of the mediation of the tradition and the abiding community, is the essential incapacity of men who do not know Christ for hearty faith in God. 'Without Christ I should be an atheist',—that is the express or silent necessity which is here assumed for men who do not know Christ. The consequence corresponds to the presupposition which places Christianity in sharp contrast with extra-Christian humanity. The kingdom of God, or the Christian community, or the church as the object of faith, or the redemption-connection proceeding from Christ,—that is the sole region of redemption, and the necessary, eternally abiding collection of the redeemed in the Kingdom of Christ. It will last till the end of humanity, and will extend unto eternity as the collection of humanity in the religious communion of absolute salvation and of absolute truth made possible by truth" (p. 13). Evidently those who think thus cannot raise a question of the historicity of this Christ without self-stultification.

There can be no question, then, of the historicity of Jesus except among truly modern thinkers who know, like David Friedrich Strauss (in his Christian period) how to distinguish between the principle of Christianity and the Person of Christ (p. 10); and who have learned that "in the first instance Christianity is a living faith in God, new at every moment, and that redemption is an ever new work of God in the soul through the operation of faith in God",—"or, otherwise expressed, that Christianity is a particular faith in God, a peculiar knowledge of God with its corresponding mode of life, or, as it is called, a religious

idea or a religious principle"—not, however, necessarily intellectually or philosophically conceived. On this ground there is no historical work of salvation postulated in the background, and there is no inner necessity for the assumption of a historical Jesus. And it is not strange that men standing on this ground, should be moved by the increasingly radical conclusions of the historical criticism of the Gospel narratives to raise the question whether it is any longer necessary—or possible,—to give significance to Jesus for faith. In ever wider circles there is a feeling growing up that the riddle of the Gospels is incapable of solution, and that the figure of Jesus is fading from sight. And even though it be recognized that the more radical conclusions that are sometimes drawn are unjustified, can faith in God be really inseparably connected with a historical object subject to such critical doubt? "Must it not rather be made inwardly independent of all essential relation to historical elements which in any case are subject to science and which, under scientific examination show a form so far removed from the religious life of to-day" (p. 5)? "Thus there is to remain, then, nothing but a purely historical-factual and a pedagogical-symbolical significance of the Person of Jesus for the Christian idea! We are to come back to Lessing's declaration of the third Gospel, or to Ibsen's representation of the third kingdom, where religious faith maintains and propagates itself without historical supports, purely by its own purifying and redeeming force, and is to develop itself in connection with the totality of life, freely, out of its own inner depths!" (p. 23). "That in very fact", remarks Troeltsch, "seems to be the outcome of it all",—and then, he adds, a "But . . ."

But—this is never the way religion exists or propagates itself in the world. There is no clearer result of the history of religions and religious psychology than that what is essential in religion is not dogma or idea, but cultus and communion. "The third kingdom where in religion each stands off to himself and the spirit develops itself in perfect freedom and isolation in the individual, will probably never come, any more than the state and society which rest simply on the natural coalescence of individual interests or reasons" (p. 28). There will never be a really active Christianity apart from communion and cultus; and "as we need cultus and communion so also we need Christ as the head and point of union of the community. For the Christian knowledge of God has absolutely no other means of producing union and making itself visible, and lectures on the philosophy of religion will never create and never propagate a real religion" (p. 31). "So long as there exists a Christianity in any sense whatever, it will be bound up with the central place of Christ in worship" (p. 29). It is idle, therefore, Troeltsch declares, to talk of a Christianity without Christ, and if criticism ever really disproves the historicity of Jesus or even abolishes all real knowledge of Him,—that is the end of Christianity. On religio-historical grounds a Christless Christianity is an impossibility: "Christianity, in the central position of the per-

sonality of Jesus, does not have a distinguishing peculiarity which separates it from all other religions and renders redemption possible to it alone, but only fulfils in this a general law of the life of the human spirit, though after a fashion peculiar to itself" (p. 42).

To those who suppose that the historicity of Jesus may go and His personality be retained as "a symbol", which will serve the same purpose as a rallying point as His reality, Troeltsch has this to say:—"But the state of the case being such, certainly a real and principal indifference regarding the historico-critical questions is impossible. No doubt Jesus is in this sense the symbol of Christian faith in general. But those who imagine that for such a symbol a rooting in historical fact is a matter of indifference, and that the great work of the history of religions is precisely the mythical embodiment of ideas, are for their own person far removed from entering into and giving themselves inwardly with enthusiasm or practical labor to, a faith-circle the idea of which is embodied by this mythical symbol. They merely impute to believers, that they, in their humbler limitation, may be altogether content with a mythical symbol. Such imputations, as those for example made by Samuel Lublinski, are nothing more than examples of those aestheticizing toyings with reality which are so common nowadays, where the aesthete proposes to the believer that he shall satisfy his life-hunger on a mystical symbol, because he himself considers that what has to be quieted in the case is not at all a real hunger for conviction and certainty, but only a playful demand of the fantasy. For one who really belongs inwardly to the Christian life-world, it is impossible to hold that the center and head of the community, the point of reference of all worship and of all apprehension of God, is simply a myth, no matter how beautiful it may be. As God is to him not notion and possibility but holy reality, so will he stand with this, his symbol of God, also on the firm ground of real life. It is for him of true importance that an actual man lived, strove, believed and conquered thus, and that from this actual life there has flowed a stream of power and certainty down to him. The symbol is to him a real symbol only because behind it there stands the figure of a preëminent actual religious prophet, by means of whom he not only comes to the knowledge of God, but on whom he stays and strengthens himself in his own uncertainty, as he requires now and again support in a superior personal-religious authority, and reiteratedly experiences it in life. This is what is legitimate in Herrmann's talk of the 'fact of Christ'. What is under consideration, however, is not that the assurance of salvation of the individual can be won only by becoming assured of Jesus, but that there can be no productive and strengthening life-coherence of the Christian spirit without gathering about Jesus, and a gathering about Jesus must also go back to a real living life if it is to have real power and veracity" (pp. 31-33).

The point of Troeltsch's contention thus is that religion is after all a social affair and consists at bottom in associated worship, and this

associated worship requires for its persistence a rallying-point which must be envisaged as real. So soon as the reality of this rallying-point is doubted, the whole religious life centering in it crumbles. Christianity can persist, therefore, only as the historicity of Jesus, its rallying-point, remains beyond question in Christian circles. The historicity of Jesus is not given in the persistence of Christianity; it is rather its presupposition and depends, like all other questions of historicity, on the results of historical research. But whenever—if ever—the results of historical research prove unfavorable to it, then the death-knell of Christianity is sounded. It is precisely here that Troeltsch separates himself with most decisiveness from what he calls that mediating type of thought represented by Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herrmann and their followers; and in separating himself from them refuses to find in Christianity the ultimate religion and therefore to claim for Jesus the place of eternal redeemer of men. "If the central position of Jesus", he reasons, "is established by means of the miracle of a power and assurance which overcomes all weakness and incapacity to faith born of original sin, then the religion of humanity must always remain Christianity, and all religious communion in all eternity must turn about the center of the person of Christ. Then, with Schleiermacher, Christ will be designated the second Adam, or with Ritschl, He and His community are represented as the essential-purpose of God, identical with the world-purpose, and from the one as from the other a bridge can be thrown over to the old Christology of Nicaea and Chalcedon. But if it is to be established upon universal social psychological necessities, then there can be inferred from it only, that so long as the special Christian prophetic piety persists—bearing in itself the Stoa and Platonism and so much more besides—all possibility of a community and a cultus, and with them all real power and propagation of belief, is bound to the central position of Christ in faith" (p. 48). How long this specific Christian piety will persist, is no doubt, another question; and it is a question a prudent man will not be quick to give a response to. Enough for us that it is bound up with the culture of the Mediterranean basin, and for us who are the products and the vehicles of that culture another form of religion is meanwhile impossible. Christianity will abide as long as the culture of which we are the exponents abides; and so long as Christianity abides, Christ must hold the central place in faith, and that as a really existent and historical person. This is the last word of social-psychological research.

We shall not enter into any extended criticism of Troeltsch's position. The problem which he raises is a purely academic one. It amounts in effect to asking how small a place can be assigned to Christ in our religious life and His historicity yet remain indispensable. Troeltsch's contention is that though His role be reduced to that of a mere symbol, a symbol of the peculiar faith in and knowledge of God which constitutes our religion, for the fulfilment of even this

attenuated role He yet requires to have really existed. This may be true; if true, it may be interesting; but it is altogether without practical importance. For Troeltsch does not pretend that the Christianity—if it can justly be called Christianity,—which looks upon Jesus as a mere symbol is playing any large part in the religious life of the world. He does indeed tell us that “die Gegenwart” is turning with avidity to this reduced Christianity: that there are not a few to whom Jesus has become only “the historical starting-point of the Christian life-world, and His portrait only of pedagogical importance or a symbol of Christianity;” and that, if everything does not deceive us, such a point of view is destined to become very much more wide-spread in the circles of German culture than it now is (p. 17). But he also tells us that it is not manifesting any great productive power, and gives little promise of a great future: “that in fact almost all the religiousness of to-day draws its life from modifications of the strong religious treasures propagated in the churches and in them alone” (p. 23). So long as all the vital and productive religion in the world is manifested in connection with the historical (or, if you will, “traditional”) forms of Christianity, we need not concern ourselves greatly with the question whether the historicity of Jesus is indispensable also for the more advanced (or debased) forms of “Christianity” (if the word be allowed) which are without vitality or probable future. We only note, with whatever satisfaction the facts are fitted to give us, that in Troeltsch’s opinion religion cannot flourish or propagate itself, in the conditions of our Mediterranean culture at least, apart from the recognition of the historicity of Jesus, and that the historicity of Jesus is in any event an assured fact, and indeed that the fundamental character of His teaching is beyond question (pp. 4, 38). We have our own opinion here, which goes much further than Troeltsch would allow, and we believe our opinion is firmly grounded; but we are not without interest when we learn that even to an extremist like Troeltsch “the decisive importance of the personality of Jesus for the origin and formation of Christianity”, and “the religious-ethical ground character of the preaching of Jesus” are “established with certainty” (p. 38). We are pleased to hear such an extremist declare that the “allegation of the non-existence of Jesus is without doubt a monstrous thing, and also the allegation of the impossibility of knowing the fundamental traits of His preaching is a great exaggeration” (p. 4). We wish we could hear him go on and declare that doubt of the true deity of Jesus is also a monstrous thing, and denial of His great atoning act a gross absurdity. Were his opinions determined by purely historical considerations, he could so declare; and so declaring, would understand how nonsensical the raising of the question whether the historicity of Christ is indispensable to Christianity is; for he would understand that a Christianity which knows nothing of a Divine Christ or of an Atoning Death of Christ is just not Christianity at all. The question of the indispensableness of Christ to Christianity is in a word

just the question of the nature, or, as it is now fashionable to phrase it, of "the essence", of Christianity. A Christless Christianity is no more a contradiction in words than a non-atoning Christ is a contradiction in fact; Christianity involves the acknowledgement not of Christ *simpliciter* but, as Paul insists, specifically of "Christ as crucified."

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

JESUS CHRISTUS IN DER GESCHICHTE. Ein Beitrag zu den Drews- und Jatho-Debatten, von D. EBERHARD VISCHER, Professor an der Universität in Basel. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1912. 16 mo; pp. 42.

Eberhard Vischer always writes interestingly, and this Address—for it is an Address, delivered at a Conference of Christian students—is no exception to the rule. In substance it is a popular presentation of the argument developed at length and with more scientific stringency in his well-known article on "Historical Certainty and Faith in Jesus Christ," published in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* for 1898 (Heft. 3; pp. 195-260). Although, therefore, it declares on its title-page that it is a "Contribution to the Drews- and Jatho-Debates", it has only the slightest connection with these debates. They are mentioned only that the reader may be counseled to let them alone and go behind them. No doubt Drews and Jatho may be answered point by point. But what then? The real question still remains untouched. For it is Vischer's "conviction, that by this labor, necessary and meritorious as it is, the difficult questions raised by Drews and his predecessors are by no means answered; that, on the contrary, precisely by this defence the real problem which is in debate, is made a burning one,—the question, to wit, of how a historical personality, which, because it belongs to history, shares also the lot of all that is historical and passes more and more into the past,—of how such a personality can possess at the same time abiding significance, can be for humanity the guide, who guides them, despite all the changes of times and relations, most surely and most directly to the eternal Ground of all Being and Becoming. It is precisely by a defence which follows the doubts of the historicity of Jesus step by step, which takes up every consideration urged against the sources which come into account and tries its weight, that it first becomes thoroughly clear what it means that Jesus Christ too is a historical object" (p. 6). What is historical belongs to time, nay, rather to a time; and as times succeed times, it fades more and more into the past, to which, indeed, it inherently belongs, bearing its character and meeting perhaps its needs, but certainly not ours upon whom a new heaven and a new earth have dawned. Jesus Christ as a historical object cannot escape this two-fold result of his very historicity. He becomes only a shadowy figure in the fading past; and what may be discerned of Him through the mists of time belongs distinctly to the past, separated from our modern

world by a deep chasm. "What has this historical Jesus, this figure of a Jewish Rabbi in His indefiniteness and in the limitations of His times, in common with what Christianity has believed and confessed itself to possess in Christ? How can the significance which a great part of mankind has ascribed, and continues to ascribe, to Jesus for its relation to God, be combined with the knowledge that Jesus is a historical object, and all that is historical is transitory? This is the real religious problem which comes into discussion in this controversy over the historical Jesus" (p. 9).

Having thus posited the problem, Vischer addresses himself to solving it. At the outset, he is concerned that we shall adopt the right method. It is usual to begin with an investigation of the oldest tradition concerning Jesus, first of all of the conception of Christ of the earliest Christian community, and to ask, first, how far this is credible, and then how far we can recognize to-day a guide in this Jesus shown to be historical. This, Vischer considers a bad way: we shall scarcely go through with it without subjecting the results of our researches to a certain amount of manipulation to make them fit our needs. He recommends to us, therefore, an opposite way. Let us begin, he says, with the other end,—with what Jesus Christ has been and is to men, and proceed backwards from that to what He was as a historical figure. "Let us turn from the investigators who dispute over the trustworthiness of the oldest tradition, to the company of those who from the times of the first disciples until to-day have gathered about Jesus Christ as their Lord. What have they always believed that they found in and through Christ? And whence have they drawn this assurance, confident in which many have gone to their death" (p. 10)? The argument which he proposes, it will be seen, is that from effects to their cause; and the principle on which he proceeds—a principle fully developed, and defended at length, in the earlier article to which we have already adverted (*ZThK*, 1898)—is that not only a sound, but the only sound, method of reaching absolute certainty as to past things is through observation of their present effects. Of past personalities and events necessarily implied in present conditions we may have true certainty; of all other past things only a greater or less degree of probability may be attained.

Proceeding on this principle Vischer passes in rapid review what we may call the sequences of Jesus in history and emerges at length in the following conclusion. "If now, after this journey through history, after this survey of what the Christian community, yes, humanity in general have received from Jesus, and ever anew receive from Him, we turn back to the problem from which we started out, we have now found the right standpoint for replying to the questions contained in it. Now, at length we are in a position to give a clear and distinct answer to the question as to the historicity of Jesus. And it is certainly not too much to say that the arguments brought against it appear to us now simply ridiculous. Not because we now,—as no doubt we are

accustomed to hear,—occupying the standpoint of faith, have no need to give heed to the objections of historical science, but because we have struck out the method by which alone we can attain to a real, complete knowledge of historical objects, the method, to wit, of inference from the collective, still tangible, effects to their causes. Undoubtedly it is altogether right when, in order to obtain an assured judgment as to Jesus, all the testimonies to Him that lie before us, in and out of the Bible, are examined in the most exact manner, according to the methods which the historian applies in all his investigations; the Gospels, before all, as well as the Epistles of Paul, and the well-known passages in Tacitus, Pliny and Suetonius. Only so will we guard ourselves from substituting, on the ground of actual and alleged religious experiences, phantasies for the historical actuality . . . We would not, then, by an appeal to the element of faith juggle with the Christ of history. But neither would we neglect when dealing with Jesus what seems to us a matter of course in the case of every other great man. To the still existing vestiges from which we can and must infer the greatness or nature of a historical phenomenon, there belong, not merely the oldest written testimonies which give an account of it, but, much more, its work and the effects which proceed from it. It would be a remarkable historian who should carefully collect all the notices about Dante, and search the whole history of his times for traces of his existence, and not put himself under the influence of the *Divina Commedia*, but leave it to one side unheeded . . . Of course, the greater a personality is, the more important he is for the history of mankind, so much the more impossible is it for any rightly to comprehend his actuality and personality except those who stand under his influence, and possess the organs to feel the imperishable power of his work. That is true again of a Dante and a Goethe, of a Giotto and a Bach, of a Francis of Assisi, and of a Luther as well as of a Jesus. And we are asking no exceptional treatment for Him, when we reply to those who combat His historicity: Only when we attend to Jesus' effects in history and experience them in ourselves are we in position to decide this question. It is therefore quite intelligible when to the plain Christian who lives in the gospel, the conflict over the historicity of Jesus seems absurd. Only after we have traced the effects of Jesus through history and taken account of what the Christian community believes it possesses in Christ, and why it believes it possesses it, do we understand also how far Jesus Christ, in spite of being a historical man, affected in many respects by the limitations of His time, of His people, and of His locality, yet can possess abiding religious significance" (pp. 35 sq.).

What it is important to observe here is that Vischer is not arguing that the Christ of faith may be indifferent to historical assault. He is seeking the certitude of history not of faith. And he is arguing that history gives us a Jesus whose existence is not merely probable, in however high a degree, but absolutely certain; certain with the certainty of the axiom that every effect must have a cause. His method

is to point out that historical certainty does not wait upon the criticism of the witnessing documents, but may be grounded in quite other considerations; nay, wherever it exists, indeed, must always rest on other considerations—on the observation, in a word, of historical effects. Had history preserved for us no single intimation of the existence of Dante, the existence of the *Divina Commedia* would compel—not suggest—his postulation. And had historical records preserved for us no single intimation of the existence of Jesus Christ—or, what comes to the same thing, should historical criticism obliterate every existing intimation of His existence,—there exist in the world effects, quite as palpable as the *Divina Commedia*, which compel—not suggest—His postulation. What the consideration of these effects gives us is not probability, however high, but certainty. Of course the estimation of the effects and the discovery of the nature of their cause implies a certain capacity of appreciation. To infer a Raphael from the Sistine Madonna, a Beethoven from his Sonatas, a Dante from the *Divina Commedia*, implies specific endowments in the observer; likewise to infer from the effects which He has wrought in the world a Jesus Christ, has its implication also of endowments in the observer. This circumstance, however, no more in the one case than in the other, destroys the validity of the inference. It only directs us to its proper organs. Nor does Vischer desire by this appeal to the witness of the effects to set aside the appeal to the critically examined sources. So far as, under criticism, they yield a positive result, they supply, according to him, the details as to the personality inferred from His effects in the world. There could have been no *Divina Commedia* had there been no Dante; but it is from the historical notices of Dante that we draw our portrait of Dante. Our certainty that there was a Jesus is drawn from the effects He has wrought in the world; what manner of Jesus He was, we are to go to the criticized testimonies which have come down to us to tell us. To put it coarsely, our certainty of the existence of Jesus is given us in the effects He has wrought in the world; our conception of what this Jesus thus certified to us was is given us in the critically reconstructed records.

To put it thus coarsely does injustice to Vischer's position. It does not seem to do as much injustice to it, however, as it ought to. It can scarcely be contended that the inference from effects is only to the existence of a cause, without involving anything as to the nature of that cause; the qualitative is as stringent as the merely quantitative inference. It is not the existence of merely a man, but of a genius, and of a genius of quite specific gifts, that we infer from the *Divina Commedia*, the Sistine Madonna, the Sonatas of Beethoven. What from the effects Christ has wrought in the world? Vischer himself tells us (p. 11) that, in whatever various ways men may have expressed it, the one thing which Jesus Christ has meant to all the world, in all ages, may be summed up in the one word, God. What, then, if the criticism of the sources gives us, as the Jesus that really lived, not God but man?

In his eagerness not to juggle away "the historical Jesus" in the interests of the Christ of faith, and in his fear that men shall set their phantasies in the place of the historical actuality in their thought of Jesus, Vischer does not here do justice to his own principle of interpretation. When we survey the effects of Jesus in the world we are compelled to infer as cause, not some Jesus merely, but a Jesus of a very particular quality, of a quality which alone could be the cause of these effects. And that Jesus is not the Jesus which Vischer would commend to our acceptance on the basis of the criticism of the sources. How, after his survey of these effects, he can still recommend us to see in Jesus merely a man is a standing wonder. No matter what Jesus criticism extracts from the sources, the Jesus which actually was is the Jesus which is required to account for His effects in the world. Or rather, no criticism of the sources can be sound which eliminates from them the Jesus which corresponds to the effects which He has wrought in the world; for it is undeniable, that the Jesus which lies on the face of the sources is the very Jesus who appears in these effects. It will not do to attempt to account for the presence of the Divine Jesus in the historical records on the ground that it is a natural creation of those who have felt the effects of Jesus, and to substitute for Him another Jesus who stands in no recognizable relation to these effects. What needs to be accounted for is not the rise of the Divine Jesus in the consciousness of His first followers, but the fading of the Divine Jesus out of the consciousness of so many of His later followers. It is this last estimate of Him which stands in contradiction with the observed effects He has left in the world.

We wonder, in this connection, what Vischer can mean by words like these (p. 25): "Yea, even the death on the cross, this frightful enigma (*furchtbare Rätsel*), for the solving of which the deepest thinkers have ever afresh labored . . ." To Vischer Jesus Christ, though bringing to the world a revelation of God which has revolutionized the world, was after all only a Rabbi of Nazareth, who cannot Himself, but only God who has revealed Himself in Him, be our comfort and support in life and in death (p. 39). Why should the death of such an one, even on the cross, be a frightful enigma, to which profound thinkers devote continual labor in the hope of reaching a solution of it? Is there any enigma in a good man who throws himself athwart the religious prejudices of a fanatical people, falling a victim to their hate? What is there in Jesus' death more than in that of Socrates, which will justify us in speaking of it as a "frightful enigma", which ever presents itself to the investigation of profound thinkers, in the hope that, mayhap, they may fathom its mysteries? On Vischer's view of who and what Jesus was there is no mystery here whatever; no enigma to solve. What should a Galilean Rabbi do, but, after awhile, die? And what could a good man do other than die a martyr to his cause? And what could be more natural than that the zealots for the law should slay Him who made Himself greater

than Moses and the Prophets and clothed Himself (with whatever meaning) with those prerogatives of God, the forgiveness of sins on earth, the judgment of the world? (On the inevitableness of Jesus' death on Vischer's presuppositions, see the instructive exposition of Julius Kaftan, *Dogmatik* ⁴, pp. 570-572.) And as for the cross, how else could he have managed to die by judicial sentence, just then and there? If there be an enigma here to study, a mystery worthy of the thought of men of thought, it is because there is something more in Jesus than a Rabbi of Nazareth, and something more in His death than the natural end which a Rabbi of Nazareth who called down on Himself the wrath of His fanatical compatriots would make. That there was something more both in Him and in His death is certain, with that historical certainty which, Vischer insists, resides in the necessary implication of an adequate cause in observed effects. We wish he himself had followed his argument until he had uncovered precisely what this something more is.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

CHRISTUS, Manuel D'Histoire des Religions. By JOSEPH HUBY, Professeur au Scolasticat D'Ore Place, Hastings. Avec la collaboration de Mgr. A. LeRoy et de MM. L. de Grandmaison, L. Wieger, J. Dohlmann, A. Carnoy, L. de la Vallée Poussin, C. Martindale, J. Mac Neill, E. Böminghaus, A. Mallon, A. Condamin, E. Power, J. Nikel, A. Brou et P. Rousselot. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, Editeurs Ancienne Librairie Delhomme et Brigue, 117, Rue de Rennes. 1912. 4e Édition. 8vo; pp. xx, 1036.

In a day when the history of religion almost invariably is made to play into the hands of naturalism it is refreshing to find a work on this subject so complete and thorough and scientific as this, which is written from a standpoint distinctly supernatural and which, while insisting on God's general revelation of himself in nature, portrays and establishes Christianity as "the way, the truth, and the life." Of course, we regret that it virtually identifies Christianity with the Roman Catholic Church. Radically unchristian though this position is, however, it is almost a peccadillo in contrast with liberal Protestantism's virtual denial of the Supernatural.

The scope of this treatise appears in the titles of its chapters as its scientific character is seen in the fact that each one of these chapters has been prepared by a specialist in the particular field traversed. Chapter One discusses "The Study of Religions"; Chapter Two, "The Population of Lower Culture"; Chapter Three, "The Religion of the Chinese"; Chapter Four, "The Religions of Japan"; Chapter Five, "The Religion of the Persians, with an introduction on the Religion of the Indo-Europeans"; Chapter Six, "Buddhism and Religions of India"; Chapter Seven, "The Religion of the Greeks"; Chapter Eight, "The Religion of the Romans"; Chapter Nine, "The Religion of the Celts"; Chapter Ten, "The Religion of the Ancient Germans";

Chapter Eleven, "The Religion of the Egyptians"; Chapter Twelve, "The Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians"; Chapter Thirteen, "Islam"; Chapter Fourteen, "The Religion of Israel"; Chapter Fifteen, "The Christian Religion". This last chapter, which occupies almost the latter half of the book, is divided into five sections, each of which has been prepared by two specialists. These sections are as follows: Section One, "The New Testament", in which "Jesus" and then "the Faith of his Disciples" are discussed; Section Two, on "Christianity and the Ancient Soul"; Section Three, on "The Christianity of the Middle Ages"; Section Four, on "The Christianity of the Renaissance at the Revolution"; Section Five, on "The Catholic Religion in the Nineteenth Century". The volume is completed by a very thorough "Alphabetical Index". A bibliography follows each chapter; and in the case of the last chapter, each section. These bibliographies, while marred by a few strange omissions, are full and should be very helpful. This is specially true with regard to French treatises on the History of Religion. The significance of this will appear when we remember that the French are facile principes in this science.

We cannot refrain from expressing the hope that this work will soon be translated into English. Until orthodox Protestantism produces a better, we should be strongly disposed to refer our students to this Roman Catholic treatise.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

ESSAYS AND VERSES. A Souvenir. By JOHN HARRINGTON EDWARDS, Author of *God and Music*, etc. 8vo, pp. 118. 1912.

"This little volume contains a selection from papers written in later life, after a serious break in health had greatly limited working ability." "The verses were mostly pencilled to relieve the tedium of sanatorium life."

The subjects of the papers are as follows: Ferdinand Columbus and His Library", "The First Home of the Huguenot in North America", "The Threefold Mission of Music", "The Heart of Personality", "Evolution and Free-will", "The Vanishing Sense of Sin", "The God Concept in the Twentieth Century".

All of these papers are both instructive and interesting. The last two impress the reviewer as specially illuminating. He is unable to agree with the author as to "the heart of personality". Love is of the essence of personality. Is it, however, its unique distinction? A person, as Illingworth has so well brought out in his "Personality Human and Divine", must be a being who loves; but is every being that loves a person? If so, then a dog is a person. Is not the truth, however, that, as Mr. Edwards himself seems to admit, of beings that love only such are persons as morally and, therefore, consciously determine themselves? In a word, is not self-consciousness "the heart of personality"?

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

"BUDDHISM—As an Indian Sect, and as a World Religion." EDWARD LEHMANN, Professor of the History of Religion, Berlin. Published, Tübingen. 1911. 8vo, pp. 300.

The style of this book is attractive and the subject matter is presented clearly. The work is not intended to be a comprehensive treatise and commentary on the Buddhistic belief, but to set forth chiefly the facts concerning Buddhism as to its founder, teachings and geographical influence. To the student who wishes a good birdseye view of the subject the book can be recommended.

Buddhism is ranked by Prof. Lehmann as a world religion, with the same right to the designation as that possessed by Islam and Christianity. The claim to this right is not that any of them have conquered the world, but that each has "set for itself this task."

Three elements contributed to the success of Buddhism when first introduced to the world. (1) The nature of the Indian. "It is a land of dreamers. He loves to spend his hours in contemplation and thought." His training for centuries had been for meditation, not action. The ascetic life was attractive to him. (2) Many of the already accepted Vedic ideas permitted themselves to be worked over into the new faith. The great transmigration doctrine, accepted by nearly all Indians, could be inculcated with small variation into the new Buddhistic regime. (3) The Brahmanic faith was losing its grip upon the people. The people were groaning beneath the oppression of the Priests. The religious soil of India was well prepared for the reception of the seed of a new religion, or religious reform.

The founder and central figure in Buddhism is Gautama, born in the sixth century B. C. He was alleged to be of royal blood and belonged to a clan or tribe living on the banks of the Ganges River. "Gautama" was his tribal name, his own being Siddhatha. He was about thirty years of age when he received his "enlightenment" and left his luxurious home to propagate his system. His "enlightenment" came as the result of deep meditation upon the phenomena of life as it was forced upon his attention. He spread his ideas by means of conversation and preaching. He left no written word but much has been preserved to us by his disciples. The boundary dates of his life are about 560-477 B. C. Prof. Lehmann entertains no doubts as to the historicity of Gautama but admits a lack of detail in regard to his early life.

Gautama's entire teaching centers around one question "How can I obtain Salvation?" By salvation is meant "*Nirvana*"—the extinction of all desire. Gautama came not as a philosopher or reformer so much as a seeker for the answer to this question. His message to the world contained but one idea. All life is filled with *desire*. All desire is pain. The complete separation from all life or desire is salvation. To obtain salvation is difficult. There are both a negative and positive teaching to be observed.

Negative Teaching. The three great sins of sensuality, ill-will and stupidity must be overcome.

Ten bonds must also be broken: Those of 1. Delusion about the soul. 2. Doubt. 3. Dependence on Good Works. 4. Sensuality. 5. Hatred. 6. Love of Life on Earth. 7. Desire for Life in Heaven. 8. Pride. 9. Self-Righteousness. 10. Ignorance.

Four Intoxications keep one from Nirvana: 1. Bodily passions. 2. Becoming. 3. Delusion. 4. Ignorance.

Five Hindrances bind men here: 1. Hankering after worldly advantage. 2. The corruption arising out of the wish to injure. 3. Temper of mind. 4. Fretfulness and worry. 5. Wavering of mind.

The *Positive Teaching* is summed in what is called "the noble eightfold path". The obeying of these rules leads directly to Nirvana. They are: 1. Right views. 2. Right aspirations. 3. Right speech. 4. Right conduct. 5. Right mode of livelihood. 6. Right effort. 7. Right mindedness. 8. Right rapture.

Buddhism differed from the old asceticism of the east in that it demanded not meditation alone, but useful practice. A contrast between Buddhism and Christianity is seen in comparing their ideals. As the Christian approaches his ideal he forgets self and has a care for others. The Buddhists strives to forget all else and turn his mind solely to himself.

The territory of Buddhist faith is chiefly the orient. In India we find it has spread from the Ganges over the whole peninsula. Here are two great sects. The northern and southern. They have been said to differ materially in their theology, but Prof. Lehmann disclaims this assertion. He maintains that the difference is merely in the books considered sacred, the northern canon being also different from that of China and Japan. In India the faith is accepted by all classes. It was first propagated by mendicants who had no place of abode or headquarters. Near the close of Buddha's life, cloisters were established and these have aided in the spread of the faith since. In *Tibet*, Buddhism ruled in both the temporal and spiritual spheres in the same manner as the Catholic Church used to rule the Western world. In *China* the new faith occupied the place of guest rather than lord. In Japan Buddhism found its way again among the ruling class and has been supported at times by force of arms. The spread of Buddhism in Europe has been quite different from that in the East. It has found a reception, however, among a number of those who have been saturated by Pantheistic Philosophy.

In criticism of Prof. Lehmann's book, we would prefer not to call Buddhism, as he describes it, a religion at all. We may grant that as a system of ethics it is worthy of much praise. But a teaching which does not have a God as its center can contain but little worship, and the element of worship should be included in the ideas connoted by the term religion. That a teaching is widespread does not make it worthy the name of religion. Judging also by the fruits of Buddhism as seen in India and China, we do not believe that the teachings of Gautama merit all the praises which Prof. Lehmann gives them. We com-

mend the skill with which the author contrasts many of the facts of Christianity and Buddhism. With keen insight the falseness of the claims for interdependence between Buddhism and Christianity is laid bare.

Heidelberg.

RALPH A. WAGGONER.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

WIDER DEN BANN DER QUELLENSCHIEDUNG. Anleitung zu einer neuen Erfassung des Pentateuch-Problems. Von Lic. theol. WILHELM MÖLLER, Pastor in Apollensdorf b. Klein-Wittenberg, Bez. Halle; Verfasser der historisch-kritischen Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese von einem früheren Anhänger. In Kommissionsverlag bei C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 1912. 8av, 229S.

In 1866 Karl Heinrich Graf in a treatise on *The Historical Books of the Old Testament* advocated the theory that the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch was subsequent to the exile, and in 1878 Julius Wellhausen published a *History of Israel* and gave the theory vogue. Since then there has grown up in Germany a generation of pastors who have been trained in the universities in an atmosphere of thought dominated by the doctrine that the religion of Israel originated in beginnings which were still of the rudest in the fifteenth century before Christ, and slowly developed until after the Babylonian exile it attained the form exhibited in the Old Testament. It is interesting to find, in talking with these younger university-trained pastors, how many of them believe that the foundations of the theory have been fatally shaken. One of these younger men, a former adherent of the school of Wellhausen, who supposed its foundations to be unshakable, not only has come to reject the theory, but from time to time has been impelled to take the pen in hand to show the weakness of the hypothesis. Wilhelm Möller was educated at Erlangen and Halle, and in the theological seminary at Wittenberg. After completing his preparation for the ministry he became assistant pastor at Schlieben and at the same time studied oriental literature at the neighboring university of Leipzig. At various times his professors advised him and other students not to read books of other tendency, but to confine themselves to works by men of the school of Wellhausen. Professor August Köhler of Erlangen, however, drew his attention to weaknesses of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. The matter matured in his mind. In 1899, while a licensed candidate for the ministry, he published *Historisch-kritische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese*, of which the English translation, entitled *Are the Critics Right?* was noticed in this REVIEW for 1904, pp. 521-523. In 1903 his *Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit*, appeared, and in 1906 *Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten*. These three books were welcomed and commended by the evangelical press of Germany; and on their

merits the theological faculty of the University of Greifswald conferred on him the degree of Licentiate of Theology.

In his latest book, *Against the Spell of the Literary Analysis*, Möller discusses a matter that is not distinctive of the school of Wellhausen, but is yet its indispensable presupposition, the foundation on which it builds. He does not deny that much of the history recorded in Genesis was derived from oral tradition and written documents, and was likely colored in its style and diction by the words and style of the sources. But the study of the literary phenomena of the Pentateuch has convinced him of the unsoundness of the current literary analysis, and in the work which he now publishes he shows grave faults in the methods of the divisive critics and presents evidence of literary unity. He is impressed by the unreliability of that canon of the divisive criticism which assumes that similar narratives must be variant traditions of the same event. For it is an observable fact, and the basis of sound historical criticism, and yet neglected by the divisive critics, that in the annals of families and nations similar narratives, connected with different persons or different occasions, are quite as apt to be records of different events as to be variant accounts of the same event. Moreover Möller finds inconsistency on the part of the divisive critics in the application of their own theory. Sometimes they allow similar narratives to belong to the same document; at other times they pronounce similar narratives to be duplicate accounts of one event drawn from different sources, although the literary criteria do not indicate two sources: for example, Abraham twice and Isaac once denied his wife. According to the canon these stories should be variant traditions of one event and come from different sources; yet two of these accounts bear the marks of J and must be assigned to J. Möller's argument has been anticipated by the divisive critics, and Gen. xii. 10-12 attributed to a late writer of the school of J, and xxvi. 1-14, ascribed to the original J. Consistency in the application of the principle is, indeed, secured by this means; but it will be recognized that such disposition of the material as this is made solely to save the theory that similar incidents must be "variants of the same peculiar story". The divisive critics are compelled to adopt this artifice or be put to shame by Möller's argument.

Further, the author is impressed by the vicious habit of the divisive critics of insisting upon assumed or even actual discrepancies in a narrative and making them the basis for the assumption of diverse sources, apart from other literary criteria; and ignoring simple and satisfactory solutions. An improbable result is the logical and actual outcome of this method, for the sources become unduly numerous. J, E, D, and P are split into many; J¹, J², J³, E¹, E², E³, D¹, D², P¹, P², P³. This objection to the correctness of the partition has been increasingly felt (Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 205). The simplicity of the theory and its results, once used as an argument in its favor, no longer exists.

The occurrence of the word God in a passage, instead of the name Jehovah, is used by the divisive critics as a mark by which to distinguish P and E from J. The author is impressed by the small range within which this criterion can be applied; only from Gen. i to Ex. vi (p. 36). Even this range is measured too large, for from Gen. xl to Ex. iii the name Jehovah is not found except in the inserted chapter xlix, which contains Jacob's blessing of his sons; so that the criterion is applicable to forty-two chapters only. Even here the divisive critics are forced to doubtful expedients; for in these chapters from Gen. i to Ex. vi the divine name used is not always the title that should occur in the hypothetical document, and in such cases a corruption of the text is assumed or the redactor is called in or the divine title is explained by the peculiar appropriateness of that particular name to the occasion. But this admission that the divine names are sometimes used discriminatingly is perilous; for the principle is capable of considerable extension, even if not so great as Möller argues for, and sometimes removes all ground for the partition of a narrative (pp. 35-44, 174-181, 203).

The author is also impressed by the fact that in most cases the appearance of R is a sign of distress, and indicates that matter which conflicts with the divisive theory is being gotten out of the way. The fate of the divisive theory may be said almost to depend upon the granting of permission to call in the redactor's aid in Gen. xiv, Num. xiv. 11 ff, and Num. xxxiii (pp. 79-91).

In the main part of his book the author shows in detail the unity of the narrative which recounts the history of Abraham. The complete domination of this history in all its parts and as a whole by one conception is an impressive indication of one author (pp. 183-193). Further evidence of one master mind in the authorship of the Pentateuch is afforded by typical numbers. The ten *tol'doth*, or captions using such words as "These are the generations", bind the whole of Genesis together into a unit, and the formula is attached to sections from the several hypothetical documents indifferently. In Gen. ii. 4, the heading is found introducing a J section, in Gen. v. 1, a P section, and in Gen xxxvii. 2, a J and E section. To these arguments from typical numbers and the ten *tol'doth* one might reply: The symmetry could have been produced by the compiler. But there are signs of one narrator in the account of the ten plagues. If, then, the narrator drew from various sources, he did not merely compile, but gave the impress of his own style to the material. This conclusion, however, nullifies a presupposition of the divisive critics (pp. 194-199).

The author reminds his readers of the acknowledged kinship of Deuteronomy with E and J, of the resemblance of J and E to each other, and of the frequent similarity in narrative style of the hypothetical P with J and E; and as he looks at the close relationship which so often exists between the assumed documents in these respects, he feels that the sources J, E, and P, as sought to be distinguished in the nar-

ratives, are imaginary (pp. 207-210). He observes that parts of the Pentateuch which are expressly stated to have been written by Moses, and against the genuineness of which no substantial historical ground exists, show the varied literary style and suggest that the differences in style in different parts of the Pentateuch are generally owing to the different subject-matter, and are not due to different writers employing their own peculiar literary styles.

The author has not discovered anything new, and the things which have impressed him differ in importance; but with other observers he sees grave difficulties besetting the current literary analysis of the Pentateuch, which threaten the very foundations of the theory and which it is folly to ignore.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

DE ORGANISCHE EENHEID VAN HET OUDE TESTAMENT. Eerste Voor-
dracht 25 November 1911 te Leiden gehouden door Dr. A. TROEL-
STRA, Herv. Predikant te 's-Gravenhage. Leiden: A. L. De
Vlieger. 1912. Pp. 33.

The address published in this pamphlet forms the introduction to a course of lectures before the theological students of the University of Leiden. The author belongs to the younger generation of Dutch preachers. Like Wilhelm Möller, whose latest book is noticed above, Dr. Troelstra supposed in his student days that the foundations were secure upon which the criticism of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen is built (p. 28). He has come to take a different view, as this introductory lecture shows.

Dr. Troelstra comments on the origin of the newer tendency in biblical criticism. It had its start in the writings of the philosophers Hobbes and Spinoza, with whom belong Isaac de la Peyrère, a Huguenot who went over to the Romish church, and Richard Simon, a rationalist. Facts must, of course, be considered in themselves, apart from their discoverers; but when a judgment is passed upon the Scriptures, it is well to inquire what standpoint the man occupies who pronounces the judgment. In regard to the criticism of the Pentateuch in particular, its originator, Jean Astruc, being a Roman Catholic, had an entirely different attitude toward the Bible than the Protestants, and placed the church above the Bible. But, one may say, the phenomena which Astruc observed are real. Doubtless; but 1. Phenomena must be interpreted, and they do not always require the explanation which the dominant school of criticism puts upon them. 2. It is superficial from the use of diverse divine titles to conclude diverse authorship. Dr. Troelstra quotes remarks of Professor Wildeboer, particularly the sentence "One has a firm basis [for the analysis] only when in the history previous to Moses the author uses Jahve or Elohim;" and then replies that Gen. 2-4 is unanimously ascribed to J by the divisive critics, and yet Elohim occurs five times in chapters 3 and 4. One can, of course, say—and the divisive critics do say—that Elohim is used by the author, the Jahvist, in Gen. 3 and 4

for a purpose. But if the author has used the divine names indiscriminatingly in these chapters, why not in Gen. 1 and elsewhere? In confirmation of this conclusion Dr. Troelstra quotes Professor Eerdmans: "He who will analyse Genesis by means of the divine names is on the wrong track" (pp. 9-14).

The newer criticism has its bias, the author continues, and cannot in contrast to the traditional view be called the unbiased view; for to the majority of the newer critics the Old Testament is merel, the book that contains what has survived of Hebrew literature, and is not God's word. Had it remained for them the book of the words of God, entrusted by the Lord to Israel, criticism would have taken a different course. Many a critic of this school still speaks, indeed, of revelation or even of a special revelation of God in Israel; but such critics generally reduce revelation to providential guidance and mean no more than natural development (pp. 14-18).

The confessional point of view is that the Scriptures are the word of God, spoken by men of God who were moved by the Holy Ghost. Whoever regards the Scriptures thus, looks upon them as a whole, as a structure dominated by one thought, testifying of Christ. Of course one can say, "This unity is imposed upon the Scriptures. A mighty mind (or a school) has known how to create a harmonious whole out of scattered materials". But then the unity would be a philosophical, a perishing one, not a living one. Or a person could say, "The work of collecting and arranging was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit". But if so, the right conception of the Scriptures must always proceed from this completed whole. Moreover, there is evidence for the credal standpoint in the uniqueness of the Scriptures of Israel. Sir Monier Williams, who began with the thought that Hinduism and Buddhism were struggles of the human mind, which works itself upward to Christianity, came to the conclusion that the sacred books of the Indians show development in the opposite direction. Dr. Aalders concludes that no analogy is found to Israelitish prophecy among the other peoples of antiquity; and Dr. Orr points to three fundamental doctrines of Israel's religion which distinguish it from all other religions of the olden time, namely monotheism, found in the earliest literature, and God's counsel of peace for sinner's salvation, and the indissoluble relation which the Scriptures establish between religion and morality. Clearly, the credal standpoint is at least no absurdity. He who starts from these premises in his investigation of the Old Testament, premises entirely different, but more Scriptural, than the philosophic and dogmatic premises of the newer critical school, must on many points reach different results from those arrived at by that school (pp. 18-21).

Literary criticism, just as textual criticism, has its rights. But everything depends upon whether the knife of the analyzer is the instrument of the surgeon, which cuts through nothing, but only lays bare the constituent parts, or is a Jehoiakim's knife that cuts the roll containing the word of God into illegible bits. A certain school of the higher

criticism, moreover, by various combinations completely reconstructs the history of Israel; and he who dares to doubt its dogma is pronounced a scientific heretic (pp. 24, 25). Yet a different school of criticism, scientifically conducting its investigation, discovers a secure foundation for the biblical account. And among critical works on this conservative side, especially worthy of mention before students of Holland birth and speech is *De Mozaïsche oorsprong van de wetten in de boeken Exodus, Leviticus en Numeri* by Dr. Hoedemaker (pp. 25-29).

There are theologians who acknowledge Christ and call him the center of all history, yet adopt the main conclusions of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen. But why stop at Christ? If one turns away the conclusions of such criticism at the door of faith's last refuge, Christ, why not even at the first, at the Old Testament? If Christ remains, why not prophecy, miracle, inspiration? And *vice versa*, if you remove inspiration by editorial work, and in place of the miraculous deed put the miracle story and prophetic legend; if you do not seek to understand the prophets as organs of revelation, but as men who religiously and ethically were ahead of their time, where do you stand at last in regard to Christ? The author has ventured to begin these lectures because Christ is the leading thought, the key to difficulties, the point in which the diverse lines converge, the explanation of the otherwise inexplicable.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY. By Rev. ROBERT H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge; Canon of Ely. The Schweich Lectures, 1909. London: Published for the British Academy by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, E. C. 1910. 8vo; pp. vii, 94. Price three shillings net.

Examining the book of Isaiah in the light of history and archaeology, the author believes that he can discover its nucleus and trace that nucleus as it gathers material to itself from century to century until at last, after five hundred years of growth, it attains the size and form and complexion of the canonical book which bears Isaiah's name. A "more drastic analysis" is considered necessary than that "published by the Rev. G. H. Box" (p. 4), and noticed in this REVIEW, 1911, pp. 316, 317; for example, according to Mr. Box, chapters 17, 18, 29, and 30 date from the time of Isaiah, chapters 49-55 from the time of Cyrus, and chapters 56-66 mainly from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, whereas according to Dr. Kennett all of these chapters "may be assigned to the second century B. C."

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

THE MESSAGE OF THE POETS. The Books of Job and Canticles and some

minor poems in the Old Testament, with introductions, metrical translations, and paraphrases. By NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, M.A., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth; 16mo; pp. 416.

This volume forms a part of the series entitled "The Messages of the Bible", edited by President Sanders and Professor Kent. It is an interesting example of the conclusions of modern radical criticism. It is alleged "to represent the definite results of sober scholarship"; it would appear, however, that many of its statements are due less to careful investigation than to conjecture. In addition to the commentary on Job and Canticles the volume includes a metrical translation, with notes and interpretations, of thirty minor poems from different parts of the Old Testament.

The Book of Job is shown to be of composite character. The writer states his inability "to share the naive and pathetic faith in the integrity of the book". Part of it may date from the fifth century B. C. The dialogues are much later than the fragmentary prose introduction; the "speech of Jehovah" dates from the early Seleucid period; the Elihu addresses, from the second century B. C. "The speech of Jehovah" is not pertinent to the discussions to which it is appended; and the ground it assumes is "specious". The Book as a whole "leads to no clear cut conclusion" and throws little light upon the problem it discusses.

As to the "Canticles" the writer dissents from the ancient endeavor to see in the verses a suggestion of the love of Christ and His Church, and also rejects the more modern endeavors to interpret the book as a dramatic composition. He finds it to be "simply an anthology of love lyrics, describing with much charm and delicacy the frankly sensuous and somewhat unconventional love of man and woman". The Book is composed of nineteen such lyrics.

In the thirty "minor poems" are found what seems even to the author a remarkable embodiment of polytheism and crude religious practices.

The average reader will often find it difficult to recognize the source of many of these so-called "Messages from the Bible".

Princeton,

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

DAS APOSTELDEKRET (Acts 15, 28, 29) SEINE ENTSTEHUNG UND GELTUNG IN DEN ERSTEN VIER JAHRHUNDERTEN (PREISSCHRIFT). VON K. SIX. S. J. Innsbruck Druck und Verlag von Felizian Rauch (L. Pustet) Regensburg, Rom und New York: bei Friedrich Pustet. Pp. xx, 166.

The treatise bearing the above title forms the fifth instalment of the "Veröffentlichungen des biblisch-patristischen Seminars zu Innsbruck". It confines itself to the discussion of the Apostolic decree strictly so-called, and does not profess to deal with the larger subject of the Apostolic council, or even with the Apostolic letter addressed by that meeting to the churches. Nor does the author examine in detail the relations between Acts xv and Gal ii, except in so far as this proves

unavoidable in dealing with the decree. The treatise is divided into two parts, an exegetical and an historical one, the former relating to the origin of the decree, the latter to its enforcement in the first four centuries of the history of the church. Under the head of the origin the author deals first of all with the textual problem. He rejects the interpretation of the decree as an exclusively moral prescript on the basis of the form in which it appears in the Western text, which omits the words *καὶ πνικτῶν* and adds the golden rule, *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἐαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν*, and is therefore understood by most of the advocates of its priority to take αἷμα not in the sense of "eating of blood" but of "murder"; and *εἰδωλοθύτα* in the looser sense of "idolatry" rather than in the strict sense of "meat of animals sacrificed to idols". This peculiar interpretation goes as far back as Tertullian. In modern times it has been advocated by Hilgenfeld, A. Resch, G. Resch, Lake, and especially of late by Harnack, who had at one time rejected both it and the Western text on which it is based, but now is of the opposite opinion and thinks that the moral interpretation of the decree renders support to the credibility of Acts and removes the main obstacle to the reconciliation of Acts with Galatians. It seems to us that Six very properly maintains the separability of the two questions, the textual one and the exegetical one (moral or ceremonial interpretation of the prescripts). Of course, if the *πνικτῶν* is original, the decree cannot be of exclusively moral import. But it does not follow that, if the *πνικτῶν* is secondary, the moral interpretation is thereby made necessary. The author is even willing to concede on purely textual grounds that *πνικτῶν* may be an interpolation dating from the very early part of the second century, and yet maintains with much force, that, after its elimination, what remains must be understood as referring to eating and not to idolatry as such or murder. The omission of *πνικτῶν* and the occurrence of the golden rule should not be allowed cumulative force in favor of the moral exegesis, because on the one hand these two features do not occur uniformly together in the variant texts, and on the other hand it cannot be proven that the addition of the golden rule necessarily imparts to the preceding clauses a moral import, the golden rule being quite in place immediately after the prescript to abstain from certain externals for the sake of not giving offense to Jewish fellow-Christians. For such as may have been captivated by Harnack's skillful presentation of his view we can recommend the reading of these pages. It will probably convince them that the more common view is by no means discredited and can well maintain itself, even if the Western text should come to be accepted.

In the further exegetical examination of the decree Six takes pains to differentiate its contents sharply from the dietary ritual observances prescribed in the Old Testament law for the Jews as such. It rests on a broader basis, which the Old Testament law itself makes obligatory not merely upon the Israelites but upon the sojourners with Israel as well. Its basis is found mainly in Lev. iii. 17; vii. 26 ff.; xvii. 10-14;

xix. 26, passages which emphasize the obligation of the things spoken of for the advenae. On the other hand the prescripts are not to be identified with the so-called "Noachian Commandments", for these were supposed to apply to the Gentiles at large, as well as to people associating themselves with Israel. The rules must be understood on the basis of a regulation of the life of proselytes. As to the question, whether the Apostles for the first time formulated them with this basis in mind, or already found them in existence as proselyte-rules and merely applied them to Gentile-Christians, the author is non-committal. It should be noticed, however, that he rejects A. Seeberg's hypothesis, according to whom the Apostles in the original form of the decree had only forbidden the eating of meat sacrificed to idols and fornication, whilst the other two items, abstinence from blood and things strangled, entered subsequently into the decree, being taken over from the "Wege", a much read Jewish catechism used in connection with the proselyte-baptism. Seeberg thinks that perhaps at the council James may have already proposed to incorporate these items, but that they were not at that time inserted. But at the time of the writing of Acts they had already become a recognized part of the decree.

The purpose of the decree was to facilitate the association of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Only this must not be understood as an attempt to render possible a living together of these two elements without restrictions. Particularly community of eating was not contemplated; for that far more thoroughgoing abstinence would have been required of the Gentiles than these simple, fundamental rules prescribed. What Peter did at Antioch was something lying altogether beyond the scope of the decree. The much-disputed sentence of Acts xv. 21, is interpreted in this sense that the reading of Moses in the synagogues constantly brings to the attention of those who hear it, Jews and proselytes both, that such fundamental requirements are made of all who desire to associate with Israel, and that the Gentile Christians therefore must not give offense to the Jews or Jewish Christians in a matter of which the latter are kept in constant remembrance and in regard to which they are particularly sensitive. But with the enforcement of the Levitical law in the sense in which strict Jews imposed it on themselves this had nothing to do. Hence the author is able to argue that Paul could pass by the decree in silence, when the controversy was about the imposition of the law as such, and even the οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο of Gal. ii. 6 retains its full force, if it should be understood, as usually it is, of legal impositions, although it might in the author's opinion, very well be interpreted of doctrinal additions to the Gospel, as suggested by the Latin version *nihil contulerunt*. At any rate the Apostolic decree is not the *rocher de bronze* on which it can be claimed that the historicity of Acts must suffer shipwreck.

In the second part of the treatise it is shown how subsequently, when, with the disappearance of the Jewish element in the Church, the primary purpose of the decree became obsolete, a new meaning came to

be attached to it and it gradually changed into a dietary rule. In the tracing of this process during the first four centuries the author largely depends on the material collected by Böckenhoff in his work *Das Apostolische Speisegesetz in den ersten fünf Jahrhunderten*, 1903. The main element deserving attention in this part of the work is the correction of the presently prevailing views concerning the attitude of the occidental fathers towards the decree. After a period of relative legalism the West returned in a practical and exegetical aspect to the original understanding of the Apostolic rule.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

THE EARLIER EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. Their Motive and Origin. By KIRSOPP LAKE. Rivingtons. London. 1911. Pp. xi, 466. Price 16s. net.

In this book Lake discusses the Thessalonian Epistles, the Epistle to the Galatians, the Corinthian Epistles, and the Epistle to the Romans. His treatment of them is concerned chiefly with the literary and historical problems of their origin, special attention being given to the religious conditions of the Graeco-Roman world and to the more important textual phenomena of the Epistles and Acts. After reviewing the outline given in Acts of the events of St. Paul's life, there is a chapter on the Judaistic controversy, the Gentile converts, and the background of Gentile Christianity,—with an appendix on the text of the Apostolic decrees.

In explaining the Hellenistic movement in the early Church and the development of the Church at Antioch, Lake calls attention to the presence in Judaism of a liberal party which no longer insisted on the observance of the ceremonial law, citing Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 2.4; Philo, *de migr. Abr.*, Mangey, i. 450, Cohn-Wendland, ii. 285ff; *Oracula Sibyl.* iv. 24-33 and 162-170; Babylonian Talmud, *Yebhamoth*, f. 46a. It is thought probable that the subject was discussed in Jerusalem at the time of the famine visit, even if the theory—which Lake accepts—that this visit is described in Gal. ii. 1-10 be rejected. The historicity of the decrees is defended in the shorter Western form without the Western addition. In this form they are interpreted as a moral and not a food law (following Resch, Wellhausen, and Harnack; cf. also the Ambrosiaster in Wordsworth and White, Wolf, *Curae Phil. et Crit.*, 1742, ii. 1225; and Mill, *Proleg.* 45 col. 2 and 61 col. 2). The origin of the Neutral or Alexandrine form is explained by the influence of a Christian food law, knowledge of which is shown in the West by Irenaeus (Euseb. *H.E.* v. 1. 26) and Tertullian (*Apol.* ix) who do not connect it with the decrees, and in the East by Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* ii. 7; *Strom.* iv. 15) who does. Πνικτων—Tertullian's "suffocatis"—is supposed to have crept into the text from a marginal gloss in explanation of αἷμαρος and to have originated at Alexandria as a reaction of the Christian food law first on the exegesis and afterwards on the text of the decrees.

The Thessalonian Epistles are held to be genuine,—the Second in

some doubt but with the balance of probability in its favor on Har-nack's hypothesis of the address. Both were written on the Second Missionary Journey, the Second shortly after the First, and both probably from Corinth. Timothy, it is thought, brought back with him a letter from Thessalonica, and First Thessalonians is in part an answer to it,—with particular reference to Timothy's report as to the Gentile Christians, Second Thessalonians having reference to the Jewish Christians. The two elements in the Church must have existed apart; and it is due to their separateness that Second Thessalonians was ever written.

Lake thinks it not unlikely that Peter had been in Corinth and that the Peter party there was composed of his converts. Rübiger's suggestion that ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ in 1 Cor. i. 12 be translated "but I am of Christ" is preferred to J. Weiss' interpolation hypothesis. Arguing from ἀπὸ πέρσου (2 Cor. viii. 10; ix. 2) and from the fact that for Paul the year would begin in October, it is held that First Corinthians was written in the spring of the year in the autumn of which Second Corinthians was written, and from Ephesus. Between the writing of First Corinthians and 2 Cor. i-ix Paul made a visit to Corinth and wrote a letter—now partly preserved in 2 Cor. x-xiii,—the "Four Chapter" hypothesis of Hausrath being adopted in the form advocated by J. H. Kennedy, i.e. in a form which meets the objection that the "offender", who must have been prominent in this letter, is not mentioned in these chapters by maintaining that they are not the whole of the severe letter but only the concluding part.

Lake adopts the South Galatian theory of the address and dates the Epistle to the Galatians before the Apostolic Council. He thinks it was written as Paul was on his way from Antioch to Jerusalem. The objection to this view based on the resemblance of Galatians to Romans—like contents implying similar temporal conditions—is met by an interesting but far from conclusive analysis of Romans. From the omission of chapters xv and xvi—except verses 25-27—in the *breves* of Codex Amiatinus, in the *capitulatio* of Codex Morbacensis, by Cyprian and Tertullian—argued chiefly from silence,—by Marcion, and probably by Z—the archetype of DEFG—or in MSS known to the scribe of Z, and the insertion of the doxology at the end of chapter xv by the great majority of the Greek MSS and probably also by the oldest type of the Old Latin,—from these phenomena the existence in the Second Century of a short recension is inferred which omitted chapters xv and xvi but had the doxology. This recension omitted also the reference to Rome in i. 7 and 15 (Origen, Ambrosiaster, and G—representing Z). The theory that the short recension was made by Marcion (Sanday, Headlam, Corssen, von Soden) is rejected. With Corssen the genuineness of the doxology is questioned; and the address of chapter xvi to Ephesus is favored. Lightfoot's view that Paul produced the short recension after the longer is set aside as is Renan's more complicated theory. Lake concludes that the short recension represents a letter written by Paul at the same time as Galatians in connection with the question of Jewish and Gentile Chris-

tians for the general instruction of mixed Churches which he had not visited. These Churches had sprung up round Antioch and further on in Asia Minor. Later Paul sent a copy of the short recension from Corinth to Rome and added the last chapters as an expansion of the practical exhortations (p. 365).

The book is concluded with a brief but pointed answer to the radical criticism of the Pauline Epistles by van Manen, and with a characterization of different types of religion which issues in a contrast between and partial vindication of the evolutionary and eschatological or catastrophic points of view in the religious interpretation of history.

Errors of printing are not numerous. The following occur:

- 47, b[ottom]6, "Deitzenstein" for "Reitzenstein".
 58, b13, *ειδωλοθύτοι* for *ειδωλοθύτου*.
 70, b3, *γοραῖοι* for *ἀγοραῖοι*.
 104, 13, "two years" for "a year".
 111, 11, "Achaea" for "Achaia".
 136, 15, 'Απόλλω for 'Απολλώ.
 171, b3, "des" for "der".
 — b2, "Apostolische" for "apostolischen".
 182, b2, "Hellenistische-Romische Kultus" for "Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur".
 184, b1, δὲ for δέ.
 199, b5, ὥρας for ὥρα.
 — b4, μόνῳ for μόνῃ.
 — b3, καλοῦντες τέ for καλοῦν-
 τές τε.
 — b2, δαίμονα for δαιτυμόνα.
 204, b1, ἐμπνευσαι for ἐμπνέσαι.
 205, 13, "Luciusi n" for "Lucius in".
 212, b3, "Heitmüller" for "Heitmüller".
 214, 1, Χριστω for Χριστῷ.
 221, b7, "Graceos" for "Graecos".
 222, b4, "Weizsacher" for "Weizsäcker".
 234, 10, "Judiastic" for "Judaistic".
 235, b5, "Heitmüller" for "Heitmüller".
- 235, b2, "Lutger" for "Lütger".
 236, 6 and 237, 6, "Bergen" for "Berger".
 244, 12, after "Dei" insert "et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei".
 — 19, after "visionem" insert "aliquam orationem".
 — 20, before "haec" insert "...".
 281, b3, "66" for "60".
 306, b7, ἐμῇ for ἐμῇ.
 308, b10, "Neue" for "Neuen".
 — b7, "Neue Testament" for "Neuen Testaments".
 310, b4, Ὑπο for Ὑπὸ.
 315, 10, ἐνθάδὲ for ἐνθάδε.
 — b9, δὲ for δέ, οὖς for οὖς.
 — b3, Ἀντώνιος for Ἀντώνιος.
 370, b6, "Gemeindes" for "Gemeinde".
 371, b1, "judischen" for "jüdischen".
 372, b16, "interiisent" for "interis-sent".
 376, b2, "litteratur" for "Litteratur".
 377, 12, "Mathaeen" for "Matthaeen".
 383, b2, ἀνακαίνιςις for ἀνακαίνωσις.
 400, b14, "morgenlandisch" for "morgenländisch".
 445, 10, "the wholly" for "wholly the".

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

THE HISTORIC JESUS. A Study of the Synoptic Gospels. By CHARLES STANLEY LESTER. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London. 1912. Pp. xi, 426. Price \$2.50.

This book is written for laymen. It is an attempt to discredit the Jesus of the Gospels and to commend another Jesus,—the Jesus that the author creates and designates "historic". The process by which the transformation is wrought is called the "Higher Criticism", of which large scholarship and beneficent influences are freely predicted. The principles which underly this process and occasionally find explicit expression in the discussion are naturalistic. The possibility of prophecy or miracle is denied. The resultant elements of religious faith are God, freedom, and immortality, with a certain enthusiasm for the moral dignity of the "historic" Jesus. The laymen who are sufficiently free from "prejudice" will find here the light in which the scholar in the seclusion of his study has long rejoiced, and will perhaps not be insensible to the delicately reiterated compliment of inclusion among the "intelligent". It will not however require exact knowledge of the data and principles of historical criticism to enable the reader to recognize the difference between strong assertion or emphatic denial and reasoned proof. In fact much of the author's argument affords a good illustration of the subjectivity which characterizes a certain type of current New Testament criticism. A consideration in detail of the merits of such criticism can scarcely prove useful when there is so little agreement on principal grounds. But it is strange even on the author's principles and under his methods that the statement should be made (p. 188) that "the account of the 'Transfiguration' is given only by Mark" and that interest should be expressed "to know why the others omitted it".

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

THE APOLOGIES OF JUSTIN MARTYR. Edited by A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A., Vicar of Carrington, Sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter College, Oxford. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1911. Pp. lviii, 154. Price 7s. 6d.

The high value and excellent form of the Cambridge Patristic Texts characterize this addition to the series. Besides the textual and explanatory notes conveniently printed at the foot of each page, there is a brief but instructive Introduction treating of Justin's life, the Apologies and their place in history, Christianity and the State, Justin's theology in its various aspects, Justin and the New Testament Canon, the number and date, the MSS, editions and analysis of the Apologies, and a table showing the differences from Krüger's text. Among the editions that of Gildersleeve has been missed, and the bibliography is not complete; but the indices are useful. On page liv. 1994 is a printer's error for 1904.

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

MOUNTAIN PATHWAYS. A Study in the Ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, with A New Translation and Critical Notes. By HECTOR WAYLEN. Introductory Letter by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Second Edition: Revised and Enlarged. Oct; pp. xviii, 128.
Kegan Paul, French, Trübner & Co., Ltd. Broadway House,
Carter Lane, E. C. 1912.

'It was with a desire to ascertain more exactly what really were our Lord's ethical teachings in the Sermon on the Mount, and to produce a more correct translation than had hitherto been set forth, that the present work was undertaken.' The author does not regard these teachings "as counsels of perfection" quite out of the sphere of practical politics". On the contrary, he considers them "the Manifesto of a new leader of men", of that man who was and is "the true Son of God", and so our supreme Lord. They are his laws from heaven for our life on earth. What, then, can be so important as that we should obey them, and, consequently, so indispensable as that we should understand them? But can we be sure that the Sermon on the Mount is really the teaching of our Saviour? This raises the question discussed in the First Chapter, "In What Language did Jesus speak"? The "Sermon" as we have it is in Greek, but did Jesus speak Greek? No, but Aramaic, the language of the common people of Palestine. His sayings, however, would be remembered; and "independently of an inspirational influence which, as it was promised, would bring all things to the minds of the disciples", they could be recorded. This was done; and as Greek was the language then of the common people of the Roman Empire, it would naturally be done in Greek more or less influenced by the Hebraistic Greek of the New Testament. Thus the Gospels came to be composed; and the later criticism of them puts it beyond doubt that they represent the original teaching of our Lord. This teaching in so far as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount is discussed in eleven chapters entitled as follows: "Who are the Meek?" "The Law of Marriage", "The True Nature of an Oath", "Christian Non-resistance", "Let Him have Thy Mantle also", "Our Continual Bread", "Treasures upon the Earth", "Judge Not", "The Way of Life and the Way of Death", "Many Powers", and "The Lamp of the Body".

All of these chapters are interesting; all of them are suggestive; all of them should be read by every one who would understand the ethical teaching of this great discourse: but we find ourselves compelled to differ from the writer often and seriously. In spite of his commendable and not too common effort both to avoid the error of those critical scholars who have no use for spiritual illumination and the mistake of those believers in the inner light who scorn criticism and even scholarship as unspiritual, his interpretations seem to us frequently to distort our Saviour's meaning. Thus we cannot think that the command "Swear not at all" makes all swearing wrong any more than we can believe that the Sixth Commandment renders the taking of life in self-defense, in defensive war and in capital punishment, sinful. It seems to us that it is profane swearing which is forbidden in the former case as it is murder which is prohibited in the latter. Otherwise, why did our Lord swear when put on oath by the High Priest at the time of his trial? To say, as our author does, that he had to;

"for silence at that moment might have been taken by the people as a sign of fear, or even as a doubt or denial of his claim"—this is not an answer. Our Lord could have done as Friends to-day when called on by the court to testify under oath are accustomed to do; he could have declined the oath but given his testimony: and this he ought to have done, even at the risk of being misunderstood, if under all circumstances and in itself swearing were sinful.

Again, we cannot accept our author's doctrine of non-resistance. It seems to us to involve several fallacies. Among these are, that the disinclination of the early Christians to military service proves the inherent sinfulness of the appeal to arms: whereas the reason why the early Christians so generally refused to enter the army was not that they regarded the soldier's life as in itself wrong, but that it then commonly required the offering of sacrifices to strange gods; that the use of physical force destroys reliance upon God: whereas those who have put their trust most in God have often been those who, like Cromwell's Ironsides, have kept their powder dry and handled their guns most effectively; that government by force is essentially the placing of the material above the spiritual: whereas, as in the case of every strong government, it may be the subjection of the material to the spiritual; that man is only spirit: whereas he is also body. Beyond this, Mr. Waylen's doctrine of non-resistance must logically issue in submission to and even in coöperation with evil. To let the robber strip you of the property with which God has entrusted you, to let the murderer destroy the life for which God holds you yourself responsible, to let him kill your brother whose keeper God has made you, to let other nations crush the nation of which God has constituted you a citizen, all of which the doctrine of non-resistance under consideration requires whenever to prevent any of them an appeal to force because necessary—what is this but to assist at the triumph of evil: it is not to suffer wrong patiently; it is to submit to wrong and so to do wrong basely. Surely "resist not evil" cannot mean this, unless no other honest interpretation be in sight. But one is in sight and at hand. Our Lord in St. Matt. v:39 et seq. is referring to a common perversion of the *lex talionis*. What he would forbid is the taking of the law by the individual into his own hands. This was required under the Old Testament. This is forbidden under the law of love which Christ is promulgating. From the standpoint of his own interests the Christian is not to resist the evil man. So far as he himself is concerned, in his individual capacity, he is to love his enemy so much as to be ready to turn to him his left cheek when his right one has been smitten, to give him his coat when he has stolen his cloak, to go with him two miles when he has compelled him to go with him one. This does not, however, imply that he will always or often do this. It usually means that he will act quite otherwise. True love for his enemy will keep him from suffering his enemy to wrong and hurt himself as he would do were he to assault him or to rob him or to domineer over him. But in addition to this, no one

can act only in his individual capacity. He sustains other divinely established relations. He is a member of the state or institute of rights. As such he is bound to do what he can to aid the state in the administration of justice. That is, he ought to resist and arrest even the wrong doer whom he himself has forgiven. This is not a strained interpretation. It is the only one which does not slight some phase of the situation. All force is wrong when wrongly used, but even physical force is one of the powers which ought to be brought "into captivity to the obedience of Christ". Our author is utterly wrong when he plants himself on the assumed principle that 'force should have no place in human affairs except when its use would be good for those on whom it was brought to bear (p. 48). Logically, this condemns all punishment, divine as well as human.

Once more, we must take exception even more seriously to the chapter on "The Way of Life and the Way of Death". Our author holds that well doing assures immortality, that wrong doing culminates in annihilation. He overlooks that God is essentially immortal and that man is made in "his image and after his likeness". He regards "eternal punishment" (Mt. xxv:46) as signifying neither everlasting misery nor immediate personal annihilation, but he does not show how this squares with that tremendous passage concerning the worm which dieth not and the fire that is not quenched.

The new translation of the Sermon on the Mount, with which the book closes, is freer than the Authorized or the Revised Version and it is often suggestive: but here and there it is distinctly inferior; as for example, the rendering, in verse 48, chap. v, "universal" instead of "perfect".

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

BIBLIOTHECA REFORMATORIA NEERLANDICA. GESCHRIFTEN UIT DEN TYD DER HERVORMING IN DE NEDERLANDEN. OP NIEUW UITGEGEVEN EN VAN INLEIDINGEN EN AANTEKENINGEN VOORZIEN DOOR DR. S. CRAMER EN DR. F. PYPER. S'GRAVENHAGE MARTINUS NYHOFF 1910. ZEVENDE DEEL. BEWERKT DOOR DR. S. CRAMER.

This seventh volume is edited by Dr. S. Cramer. It is a veritable treasure-house of information concerning the Dutch Anabaptists. Five distinct and rare writings are here reprinted and are thus made easily accessible to the student of Church History. They are: 1 "Successio Anabaptistica. Dat is Babel der Wederdoopers. Door V. P. MDCIII". 2 Bekenentisse Obbe Philips. 1584. 3 Tegenbericht op de Voor Reden vant groote Martelaers Boeck. Door Hans Alenson 1630. 4 Nicolai's Inlasschingen in Bullinger's "Teghens de Wederdoopers" MDLXIX. 5 (Carel van Ghendt) "Het beginsel der scheuringen onder de Doops-gesinden". These five reprints contain most of the literature extant, belonging to the 16th century, which touches the early Anabaptist history in the Netherlands. The third mentioned tract was apparently

the only remaining copy of a once popular work and is therefore rescued from the danger of extinction; and the same may be said of nearly all the documents reprinted in the B.R.N. as everyone of them is extremely rare. And so faithful is the work done by Dr. Cramer and Dr. Pyper, that they have reproduced the old texts even to the minutest details, so that a student possessing these priceless volumes can do work now, with ease and at home, which only a little while ago would have compelled him to the herculean task of extensive and expensive research in foreign libraries. The editors of these imposing volumes have therefore placed the Church historian under lasting obligation.

The reading of this seventh volume creates a startling impression of the excessive bitterness of the early Anabaptist spirit. It is a story of endless schisms and quarrels and working at cross purposes. Little has been written about the early Anabaptist history and that little is therefore worthy of the closest scrutiny. As one reads these introductions from the hand of Dr. Cramer, he is forced to admire the painstaking care, with which the evidence of the authorship of these tracts has been sifted to the finest details, so that the final word may be considered to have been spoken on the subject.

I. As to the author of the "*Successio Anabaptistica*", who signs himself V.P., it is suggested by Scheffer, the great authority on Anabaptist history, that the letters may stand for "Vice Pastor", a suggestion, which on apparently sufficient grounds, has been rejected by Dr. Cramer. Van Heussen and Van Ryn 1726 identify him with Simon Walrave, an exiled Catholic, who became a priest after the death of his wife. Dr. Cramer takes this suggestion for what it is worth, since it is not corroborated by any other evidence. The two letters V.P. remain an apparently insoluble mystery. But whoever the author may have been, he was evidently intimately acquainted with the Anabaptist movement, and Catholic though he was, the utmost scrutiny of the work by Dr. Cramer and others, has failed to impugn his fairness as a historian. Dr. Cramer tells us "his little tract deserves the fullest confidence" (p. 6). He attacks the claim of apostolic succession, set up by the early Anabaptists, and tells a weird tale of the endless schisms, bitter strife and mutual intolerance, which characterized them. De Hoop Scheffer has repeatedly shown that he considered this tract a reliable historic source. It was originally printed at Cologne in 1603; it occupies 87 pages in the B.R.N. and is divided into 21 chapters.

II. The second tract here reproduced is the "*Bekentnisse Obbe Philips's*" 1584, printed at Amsterdam by Cornelis Claesz. It fills only thirty pages of the B.R.N. but is well worth reading. It is a confession on the part of its author of having assumed the ministry of the word without a divine warrant and is written in a deeply moving style. It seems to me to be of even greater historical value than the first-named tract, in that it is written from the standpoint of deep and immediate experience, by one who had lived with and ministered

to the Anabaptists for many years and who finally felt himself compelled to separate again from their communion. The author's introduction to the tract is very interesting and still more so that of Dr. Cramer in the volume before me. Says he—"No more circumstantial or vivid, no more deeply conceived or more finely expressed, no more reliable picture of the sentiments and ideas, which in the years 1534-1536 filled the breasts of the Dutch Anabaptists and of the attitude which then characterized them, has come down to us from that time that that which is offered by Obbe Philips's "Bekentnisse" p. 91. His tone is not that of the renegade, we catch no note of bitterness in his writing, there are apparent tearsplashes on his pages. In these two volumes of the B.R.N. nothing has affected me deeper than the reading of this tract. From the "Bekentnisse" it is plain that the "Doopsgezinden" and the revolutionary Anabaptists of the Münster party were originally one. Small wonder that this little tract was bitterly attacked from the very day of its appearance. It has been called a "partisan libel" and its author a "Demas". And yet all later historical investigations have proved that Obbe's "Bekentnisse" is one of the few truly reliable historical documents of the Anabaptist development. Dr. Cramer disproves the accusation of the author's return to the Catholic Church (p. 95). The last years of his life were spent without any ecclesiastical communion. No one will begin to read this tract and lay it aside without finishing it. It reminds one strongly of the great historical "Confessions" and is a true mirror of what passed at least in some Anabaptist hearts.

III. Next in order comes—Alenson's—"Tegen Bericht op de Voorreden vant Groote Martelaers Boek". Its appearance in this collection is due to the fact that it contains accounts of Anabaptist martyrdoms mentioned nowhere else and also to the extreme value of the writing, there being only one copy of it in existence, so far as known. Of the author nothing definite is known. The aim of the writing is two-fold. It combats the general censorious tenor of the introduction of the Martyriology of 1626 by conservative Anabaptists, who had denounced the Christological errors of the authors of the original work of 1615. According to the latter the early Anabaptists had been quite generally affected with the Hoffmanian idea of the incarnation, in accordance with which Christ did not receive his human body from the Virgin Mary. Alenson sides with the original authors of 1615 and claims that the omissions complained of by the editors of 1626 were merely accidental and chargeable to the printer. But in the second place Alenson combats the idea, expressed by the editors of 1626, as if those of 1615 had given a wrong impression of the general theological status of the original Anabaptists. He shows plainly that not the editors of 1626 but those of 1615 had presented a true picture of the theological life of their fathers, and well read as he evidently was in the controversial literature of the period, he has unconsciously presented us with an invaluable historical mirror.

IV. Next in order comes Nicolai's "Inlasschingen", which are a con-

siderable body of addenda to Henry Bullinger's work against the Anabaptists published in the Lowlands in 1559. The work had originally appeared at Zurich in 1531, where the Anabaptists had made a tremendous impression. Neither preaching nor persecution had been able to resist or break down their growth. Hence the bitter opposition of Bullinger, Zwingli's successor. Inasmuch as the Anabaptist strength in the Lowlands was steadily increasing, it was but natural that Bullinger's refutation of their errors should be eagerly read in that region. The Dutch translation was from the hand of Gerardus Nicolai of Norden. His close contact with the followers of David Joris led him to differentiate them from the Swiss Anabaptists and this led him to write his addenda or rather interjections of Bullinger's work. They are largely controversial in nature, but add greatly to our stock of information concerning the theology, life and morals of the early Dutch Anabaptists. Dr. Cramer's introduction is of unusual historical and critical interest and enables us to see these "*Inlasschingen*" in their true historical setting. Many things in the early life and theology of the English Baptists are here explained. The so-called "Familists" of England were the followers of Hendrick Nicolaes and both he and David Joris had written allegories of the Christian life in the form of the description of a journey from earth to heaven. Both of them thus anticipated Bunyan, who as an English Baptist must have had access to their writings and thus received his cue to the writing of the book, that was to immortalize him. Dr. Cramer suggests that Bunyan inevitably must have known of the existence of these writings, p. 286, through English translations.

V. Last in order is Carel van Ghendt's "*Het beginsel der Scheuringen*" 1658 (1615). As Dr. Cramer tells us in the introduction, this writing more than anything else has shaped our conceptions of the course of events in the Anabaptist developments. The older historians all recognized it as a reliable source. At present only seven copies of the original seem to exist. The author is not named and the letters I.H.V.P.N. are perfect hieroglyphics. With his usual historical acumen Dr. Cramer infers that the author was Carel van Ghendt. Whoever he was, he had joined the Anabaptists in 1563, after his conversion from Roman Catholicism, but was expelled from their communion. From his introduction we know the man as a true mystic, who judged the Anabaptists with kindness and had no need of any external communion, so long as he could commune with God. His severe judgments of the Reformers show us that at heart he remained loyal to his Anabaptist antecedents. Evidently a man of refinement and culture, fully familiar with the Anabaptist literature of the period, he makes a peculiarly strong historical witness. And he knew men as well as books. The tract plainly shows that he had been an eyewitness of the things he discusses and that he intimately knew the men of whom he speaks, and, though necessarily partisan, he is a fair witness and has given us a priceless historical treasure in his "Beginsel, etc". Originally written in 1615, it was published forty years later at Amsterdam.

In the B.R.N. Dr. Cramer confines himself entirely to his own field. As a Mennonite, a lineal descendant of these Anabaptists, he knows their history, as few other men do, and one wonders continually in reading his introductions, at the marvelous compass of his investigations and the closeness of his information. The student of the early Anabaptist movements will find in these volumes of the B.R.N. the main available sources for all his future investigations.

Louisville, Ky.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

BIBLIOTHECA REFORMATORIA NEERLANDICA. GESCHRIFTEN UIT DEN TYD DER HERVORMING IN DE NEDERLANDEN. OP NIEUW UITGEGEVEN EN VAN INLEIDINGEN EN AANTEEKENINGEN VOORZIEN DOOR DR. S. CRAMER EN DR. F. PYPER. ACHTSTE DEEL. BEWERKT DOOR DR. F. PYPER. 'S GRAVENHAGE. MARTINUS NYHOFF.

The eighth volume, which came to hand a few weeks after the seventh, contains 666 pages. In it we find a recital of the martyrdoms of Hendrik Vos en Johannes van den Esch, Willem van Zwolle, Hoste van der Katelyne. Christophorus Fabritius and Oliverius Brockius, Guido de Bres and Peregrin de la Grange. The editor is Dr. Pyper of Leyden University. The martyrdoms here related do not belong to the Anabaptists, but exclusively to other wings of Protestantism, and the student of Church history needs but to glance at the names on the title page to feel himself on familiar ground. The reading of these old pages is like a voice from the grave. Truly these martyrs were men of convictions so deep as to shame us, of a faith so triumphant as to stagger us in the superficiality and littleness of our spiritual attainments. We, the easy-going Christians of the twentieth century, with our complacent views of errors and errorists, with our broad and often superficial conceptions, can scarcely understand the tales of these martyrdoms. The introductions to the various reprints are from the hand of Dr. F. Pyper and are marvels of lucidity and logical acumen. Different tongues figure in this volume.

I. The first reprint is entitled—*Verprennung der Christlichen dreyen Ritter vnd Merterer zu Brussel MDxxij*. Several editions of the tract are known. It was naturally an anonymous production. The martyrdoms here described are those of John Esch and Henry Vos, with a third unknown martyr. They were monks in the Augustinian convent at Antwerp, where the reformatory spirit apparently had made great progress. When the apprehension of these three inmates failed to intimidate the rest of the monks, the entire convent was disbanded and all its inmates were placed in confinement. The case of the original three was naturally greatly aggravated. Pope Hadrian VI, the only Dutchman who ever sat on the papal throne, insisted on extreme measures, the imperial Inquisition did the same and thus the first martyrs of the Reformed faith in the Netherlands came to their death at the stake July 1, 1523. Thus their names became household-words. The copy of the process-verbal, which in some way came into Protestant hands, proves them to have been men of great intelligence and remark-

able theological proficiency. Their death made a lasting impression on Erasmus, as appears from his letter to Carolus Utenhove, of July 1, 1529. They died singing the *Symbolum Fidei*, the Doxology and the *Te Deum Laudamus*, till the smoke and fire smothered their voices. How deeply their death impressed Luther appears from his open letter addressed to the Christians of the Netherlands and from the fact that it inspired him to write his first hymn

"Ein neues lied wir heben an
Das walt Gott unser Herre,
Zu singen was Gott hat gethan,
Zu seinem lob und ehre".

The next document, referring to the same matter, is written in beautiful Latin and is entitled "*Historia de duobus Augustinensibus*". Its author is unknown but it points to a scholar and to one intimately acquainted with the whole process. Dr. Pyper—and it would seem with great plausibility—suggests Erasmus as the author. Certainly the language reminds us of him and his letter, above quoted, written six years later, proves how deeply he was impressed by this martyrdom. This document plainly indicates how completely the martyrs had broken with Rome. They stood in the full light of the new day.

The last document in this series is an old German tract, written by Martinus Reckenhofer entitled "*Dye histori so zwen Augustiner Ordens gemartert seyn tzu Bruxel*". In the main it is a translation of the above Latin document. The 62 articles of the confession of faith of the martyrs are seriatim discussed and approved by the author. Dr. Pyper has as far as possible, reconstructed the history of the author of this document, in a remarkably clear discussion, pp. 59-64.

II. The next tract here republished is the rare but inspiring document entitled "*Troostelycke Sentbrief voor allen die om der waerheyt veruloght warden*". As the title indicates, this epistle is intended as a solace and support for all those who are persecuted for Christ's sake. Says Dr. Pyper, "A more fiery incitement courageously to suffer the worst possible lot for the sake of fidelity to one's own conviction is not conceivable." And this will be the judgment of everyone who is able to read this document. There is in it an otherworldliness, which staggers us moderns with its dynamic force. It seems to conjure up before our eyes the martyrs of the ages and involuntarily reminds one of Heb. xi. It is not known with certainty whether this document was originally written in Dutch or who was the author. Naturally that sort of writing in the Netherlands about the year of our Lord 1530, if not anonymous would mean suicide. Hence the veil. Some suppose that the original was written in German. Dr. Pyper raises the question whether it might not have sprung from an English source, and in my opinion the internal evidence of stylistic peculiarities warrants this surmise. So long, however, as the foreign text is not produced and its priority proved, the document will stand as an original Dutch tract.

III. Next in order comes "*Artickel der Doctoren von Louen, zu*

welche Wilhelm von Zwollen geantwort". This paper fills twenty-five pages of the volume before me. There is considerable mystery about this martyrdom, which is most admirably treated by Dr. Pyper in his introduction. We have only the vaguest idea about the identity of Wilhelm van Zwolle. Apparently he belonged to the court-entourage of Christian II of Denmark, who in 1521 lived for a while in the Southern Netherlands, after his expulsion from his throne, and who was favorably inclined to the Reformation. His wife, the sister of the emperor, died in 1526 and Charles V, at the instigation of Margaretha, robbed him of his children, to keep them for the Church. Christian went to Wittenberg and Margaretha caused several of his Protestant courtiers, who had remained behind, to be apprehended and among these Wilhelm van Zwolle. Liberated on the demand of Christian, Wilhelm foolishly returned to the Lowlands and challenged the Louvain faculty, which was bigotedly Catholic, to an open debate. There was but one possible issue of this folly and it came swiftly. Wilhelm was incarcerated at Mechlin and Christian was unable to afford any further aid. His examination before the Inquisition proved him to be a full-fledged follower of Luther. What he believed he wrote down for the examination of his judges and thus the tract was born, which is here reprinted. The old German dialect, in which it is written, puts it beyond the reach of all but expert German scholars.

IV. The next tract is entitled "*M. Microen. Een vvaerachtighe Historie van Hoste (gheseit Jooris vander Katelyne)*". It occupies seventy-four pages of the B. R. N. The contents of this tract are thus described by Dr. Pyper in the introduction, and it is scarcely necessary to add anything to it. "A young man, a Fleming, went to England to find a future. Getting acquainted with Reformed preaching, he became an adherent of the Reformation. When in his second fatherland persecution burst out, he again bid farewell to home and country, took up the pilgrim's staff and was compelled to travel from one land to another. Temporarily returning to his native city, he was present at a service of such a character that he felt himself conscientiously constrained to bear witness against it. He did not try to save himself by flight, was soon captured, defended his faith in prison and thereby gave proof of his aptness in setting forth his belief and of his courage to meet death. A father, whose last words at the stake, before he was strangled, contained a wish that his children might have religious training, but who did not find himself at liberty, for the sake of these children, to become disloyal to the truth. A martyr, who self-consciously gave his life for the Reformation. A figure which appears before us in the full light of history, a sacrifice slain in a time, of which we practically know everything and concerning whose fate there is not the slightest uncertainty—behold Hoste van der Katelyne." The author of this tract is Martin Micron, one of the first London pastors of the Church of the Dutch refugees and evidently a personal acquaintance of Hoste. It was printed in 1555 and three years later was found on the Index Expurgatorum of Philip II.

V. Next in order we have the old Dutch tract "*Historie ende Ghesciedenis Christophori Fabritij ende Oliuerij Bockij*". The history of the martyrdom of Fabritius reads like a romance, both in the introduction of Dr. Pyper and in the text itself. Fabritius is named by different names—Marissael, Smit, Smits, Fabritius or Faber. Why, is not explained. He was one of the most noteworthy martyrs of the period, trained in a monastery, consecrated as priest, converted to the Reformed faith and pastor of a small and ever changing flock at Antwerp. With Bockius, a classical scholar and teacher, he was betrayed into the hands of the Inquisition by a woman, who claimed to be a convert, but in reality was a secret member of the order of Jesus. The court was apparently afraid of the fury of the populace when it pronounced the sentence of death. The whole story, as said above, reads like a weird tale. The people of Antwerp, unafraid of the sheriff and his minions, sang psalms before his prison during the night preceding his execution. The execution itself was evidently considered as hazardous, but was accomplished amid great popular tumult, whilst the half burned corpse of the martyr was finally disposed of after a running fight, by the sheriff and his men, by being sunk in the Scheldt. The unknown author evidently knew how to write a weird tale. The "*Bibliographië des martyrologues*" suggests Joris Wybo or Sylvanus, later on pastor of the refugee church at London, as the writer of the tract. Bockius, who was apprehended with Fabritius, was set free after two months imprisonment and exiled forever from the States, through the influence of Frederik III. The true key to the understanding of the whole story is found in the excellent introduction of Dr. Pyper. It occupies more than 150 pages in the volume before us. It contains the story of the capture of Fabritius, the confession of his faith, several letters to his wife and friends, the narration of his personal experiences and of his death.

VI. Last of all we have a voluminous French tract, "*Procédure tenues a l'endroit de ceux de la religion du Pais bas. Ausquelles est amplement deduit comme Guy du Bres et Perigrin de la Grange ont singné par leur sang la doctrine de l'Evangile*". The story of the martyrdom of Guido de Bres, the great author of the Belgic Confession, fills the last 200 pages of this volume. He is by far the most renowned of all these martyrs. Dedicated to a priestly life before he was born, he saw the light of day at Bergen in Henegou about 1522. God used him as the means of converting his entire family to the Reformed faith, for which all suffered in body and goods, whilst some attained the crown of martyrdom. De Bres was converted in early manhood. As a refugee in London he came most likely in contact with John a Lasco. As a craftsman he belonged to the glass painters, but practiced his art only a little while. During Edward's reign he returned to England and thence he came to the Lowlands when the Reformation had begun to take root there. He was a bitter antagonist of the Anabaptists and all revolutionary sectaries. After spending some time in the schools of

Lausanne and Geneva, he finally settled in his native land and preached at Ryssel, Doornik, Valenciennes, Sedan and Antwerp. From the latter place he returned to his original field of labor, in the three first mentioned cities. DeBres was a scholarly man, a fine stylist and a keen controversialist. His chief writings are, "*Baston de la Foi*" 1555; a practical controversial tract, written as a reply to Grenier's "*Le Bovelier de la Foi*", an attempted defense of Catholicism. His most voluminous work is his refutation of the claims of the Anabaptists, "*Source et Fondement des Anabaptistes ou rebaptisez de notre temps. Avec tresample refutation des arguments principaux, par lesquels ils ont accoustume de troubler l'Englise de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ et seduire les simples. Le tout reduict en trois liures par Guy de Bres 1565.*" This work indicates considerable insight in the Anabaptist situation, but is not free from mistakes and therefore a questionable historical source. Finally his, "*Confession de Foi. Faicte d'un commun accord par les fideles qui conversent espays bas, lesquels desirent vivre selon la purité de l'Evangile de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ, 1562.*" DeBres' authorship has been clearly established and in this confession the great martyr has done his best and most lasting work. For till this day this symbol is the uniting bond of faith of the Dutch Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, America, South Africa and the Indies. And it has never been revised. In 1561 deBres barely escaped the great persecution, which broke out at Doornik. A year later the house, where he had lived, was discovered and searched and all his personal papers were captured, which led to much suffering on the part of his relatives and friends. In 1566 we find him at Valenciennes, where Peregrin de la Grange is his colaborer. On the 24th of August of that year the storm of iconoclasm burst over the city. Three months later it was declared to be in a state of rebellion and the faithless and cruel governor of the province, De Noircarmes, laid siege to it. After a brief siege it capitulated. DeBres and de la Grange escaped, but through lack of food were forced to leave their hiding place. They were captured by the Inquisition and suffered a heroic martyrdom. Thus one of the great leaders of the Dutch Reformation died an untimely death.

These seventh and eighth volumes of the Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica, like all those which precede, are replete with interest. They are veritable gold-mines for the student of church history. Drs. Cramer and Pyper are doing a noble work, which may not be fully appreciated to-day, but which will place the future student of the period of the Reformation under lasting obligation.

Louisville, Ky.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

DR. McLAREN OF MANCHESTER: A Sketch. By E. T. McLAREN, Author of "Dr. John Brown and his Sisters". Second edition. New York and London: Hodder and Stroughton. 1911. 8vo; pp. iv, 272. \$1.50 net.

The sketchy character of this life of McLaren is due to the desire of the author—a cousin and sister-in-law of the celebrated preacher—to respect what she had reason to believe were his wishes in this matter. His remarkable humility and diffidence, his sensitiveness in regard to any public interest in his personality, and his extraordinary self-effacement in all his work—traits that added immensely to his power as a messenger or, as he delighted to regard himself, “a voice” of the Lord—made him shrink from the idea of having an extended account of his life and work published. But brief as it is, the book gives many a revealing gleam concerning the character of this saintly man and his eminent services as a preacher and an expositor of the Word of God. His many friends and admirers the world over will be grateful for this sympathetic and well written biography.

In its external features, the long life here portrayed was rather uneventful. Born in 1826 in Glasgow and educated in the High School of that city, and at the Baptist College of Stepney-row, transferred to Regent's Park, pastor, before he had finished his twentieth year, of the Portland Chapel, Southampton, where he remained for twelve years, then for forty-five years, from 1858 till his resignation in 1903, the pastor of Union Chapel in Manchester—these, with a number of vacation trips to Scotland and the Continent, and one to Australia made in 1888 in behalf of the English Baptist Union, are the leading dates and the chief outward changes in the story of the eighty-four years that reached their period in May, 1910. But the personality of the famous preacher is a most fascinating theme, and the author in this miniature has focused for us a life-like picture of the man in his home, in his study, in the pulpit, in his hours of vacation, as well as in his relations to the city with which his name is inseparably linked and to the church at large which delighted to honor him with invitations for addresses on great occasions.

The book, as may be expected, has much that will be especially interesting and helpful to the preacher; for beyond all his contemporaries McLaren was a preacher for preachers. Nor can the spectacle of this servant of God, who in spite of great domestic sorrows and years of impaired health—after the year 1881 he could preach but once a Sunday—not only maintained but even advanced the quantity and the quality of his annual homiletic production, fail to impress upon every beholder the wholesome lessons of faith in God, devotion to Christ, and fidelity to duty which by voice and pen he has so well taught his hearers and readers.

Concerning the variations in the spelling of the name, we are informed that he himself, after his student days, always signed himself “McLaren”, though in his first book, *Sermons preached in Manchester*, he permitted it to appear as “Maclaren”. The forms “M'Laren” and “MacLaren” were, apparently, never used by him.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

HAUPT-SACHREGISTER, SPRUCHREGISTER, BERICHTIGUNGEN UND NACHTRÄGE zu sammtlichen Banden der St. Louiser Ausgabe von LUTHERS WERKEN. Aufs Neue herausgegeben im Auftrag des Ministeriums der deutschen ev.-luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten. Pp. vii, 1101. 4to. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House. 1910.

With this, the 23rd volume, the St. Louis edition of Luther's works is brought to completion. Several years have elapsed since the appearance of the last previous volume, but the editors have not been idle; for the bulky tome beside us is more a synopsis than an index. Under appropriate titles alphabetically arranged, Luther's teaching is condensed and to some extent logically arranged. The editor, who is to be richly congratulated on his successful completion of an arduous task, hopes, and rightly hopes that this volume alone may be of service in introducing many to the teachings of the great reformer. For instance, on Erasmus we have almost three pages, on Faith twenty-one, on Papacy twelve, on Scripture seven, and so on. Of course, the reader is not expected to accept the synopsis; every sentence may be checked by reference to volume and page of the Works. This edition of Luther is intended for popular use, and by providing an index volume of this kind the editors have doubled its usefulness.

Following the large index there is an index of Scriptural passages, several pages of corrections, a letter from King Christian of Denmark to the Elector Frederick, written by Luther, and an index of dates and Saint's days to assist in determining more definitely the chronology.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

UNSER ERSTER EMIGRANTENMISSIONAR, PASTOR STEPHANUS KEYL, von PAUL RÖSENER, Pastor an St. Stephanus in New York. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House. 1908. Pp. 88.

This is not a study of methods of social or religious work, but the story of a man who gave most of his life to lightening the burdens of our Lutheran immigrants. Pastor Weyl befriended thousands and it is no wonder that there was a demand for some account of his labors. German readers both here and abroad, for the needs of prospective emigrants seems to have been before the writer's eye, will find here much to explain the meaning of the endeavors now being made to protect and befriend the newcomers at Ellis Island. The secret of Weyl's enthusiasm and self-sacrificing devotion was his religion.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

UNTERSCHIEDUNGSLEHREN DER HAUPTSACHLICHSTEN SICH LUTHERISCH NENNENDEN SYNODEN, sowie der namhaftesten Sektenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika. Zusammengestellt im Auftrag der ev.-luth. Nord-Illinois-Pastoralkonferenz von T. JOHANNES GROSSE, Evangelischlutherischem Pastor in Addison, Ill.

Vierte Auflage. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House. 1909. Pp. v. 176. Price 40 cents.

The popularity of this little book is sufficiently evidenced by the necessity of this fourth edition. The editor has revised his work throughout, and added a section on the Roman Church and other sects. For those who are not acquainted with the earlier editions it may be said that the purpose of the author is to exhibit in simple words in what respects the various Lutheran Churches in America differ from one another, also how other Christian Churches depart from the orthodox Lutheranism. The book is apologetic in form, being intended to defend the belief and polity of the Evangelical Lutherans.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

ENCHIRIDION PATRISTICUM, locos SS. Patrum, Doctorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum in usum Scholarum collegit M. J. ROUËT DE JOURNEL, S. J. Friburgi Brisgoviae. B. Herder, Typographus Editor Pontificius. 1912. Pp. xxiv, 887. Price \$3.15 net.

This hand-book is intended for the use of Roman Catholic students but others may find it of value. It contains selections from the writings of 104 early Christian writers, the last being John of Damascus. The Berlin and Vienna editions are followed when possible, failing them other modern editors and Migne. To the Greek selections a Latin translation is added, corrected from Migne. Bardenhewer is the guide in chronology. Four indices are added, chronological, theological, scriptural and alphabetical. The theological index explains the purpose of the work best. It is arranged as far as possible according to the order of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa*, and the doctrines of the Roman Church thus related to the writings of the fathers. For instance, the Roman claim to primacy and infallibility is traced to Clement of Rome, the sacrifice of the Mass to Irenaeus and the scholastic doctrine of Attrition to Clement of Alexandria. The publisher deserves all credit for excellent printing.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

TABULAE FONTIUM TRADITIONIS CHRISTIANAE (ad annum 1563) quas in usum Scholarum collegit Dr. PHIL. J. CREUSEN, S.J., cum approbatione Rev. Archiepiscopi Friburgensis et Superiorum Ordinis. Friburgi Brisgoviae. B. Herder, Typographus Editor Pontificius. 1911. 8 plates. Price 40 cents.

The student will find here in parallel columns the names and dates of the Roman bishops, the heresies and councils of the Church, and the names and dates of ecclesiastical writers, western and eastern. The dates of the popes are taken from Ehrle, with Duchesne's variations in brackets; those of the writers, from half a dozen scholars both Roman and Protestant. Matters of doubt are indicated, as are also the volumes of Migne which contain the works of the respective writers. The Roman order of councils is of course followed, and only the most

important are given. The work is useful as a handy guide to the religious writers before the council of Trent.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

THE RULE OF ST. CLARE and its observance in the light of Early Documents. A Contribution to the Seventh Centenary of the Saint's Call. By FR. PASCHAL ROBINSON of the Order of Friars Minor. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press. 1912. Pp. 32. Price 10 cents.

This beautifully printed little pamphlet by the learned author of the *Life of St. Clare* is a pretty tribute to the memory of the early days of the Clarisses, when the bond which united the Poor Ladies with Father Robinson's order was more intimate than is now generally the case. No one can read the story of the founding of the Franciscans without admiration and pity for the simplicity, sincerity and ignorance of the founder. The same is true of the beginnings of the sister organization. Though the records are few and scattered, enough remains to show that what the Franciscans endured for their rule had its counterpart in S. Damiano. St. Clare herself and others with her refused to give up the Holy Poverty enjoined upon them by their revered founder, and only continued pressure from the side of friends, or would-be friends, and the levelling effect of association with Benedictine convents, gradually forced them to abandon their original manner of life.

In brief, Father Robinson will have us believe that only two rules are known in the early history of the Clarisses. The first of these was given by St. Francis himself, and is now lost. Father Robinson thinks, and doubtlessly correctly, that it consisted simply of an adaptation of the Gospel precepts which he had selected for the guidance of his companions, and that the words of Francis given in the 6th Chapter of the *Regula* are not to be regarded as containing the whole of this first rule. But in any case, poverty and dependence on the Friars Minor for sustenance formed an essential part of it. The second rule from the hand of their friend and patron Ugolini, later Gregory IX, robbed them in effect if not in intention of the Holy Poverty, and brought them into alliance with the Benedictine nuns. Soon after attempts were made to prevent the association of the Clarisses and the Franciscan Brothers, one of the most beautiful things in the early history of these orders, and one indicative of the passing of the mediaeval ideals. Clara herself was sufficiently forceful to gain her own wishes for the mother house during her life, but after her death the order was somewhat rapidly assimilated to the prevailing type.

We regret that Father Robinson thinks it necessary to deny the historicity of the beautiful little story of Francis and Clare eating together at the Portiuncula and also to deny that the Clarisses used to engage in charitable works outside their houses. He may be right in his contention. We have no means of checking him. But if so, both St. Francis and St. Clare appear smaller than we should like to believe them.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD ALLEN, 1841-1908. By CHARLES LEWIS SLATTERY. Longmans, Green and Co., Fourth Avenue and 30th Street, New York, Bombay and Calcutta. 1911. Pp. xii + 296. Price \$2 net. Postage 15 cents.

The story of the biographer of Phillips Brooks and the author of the *Continuity of Christian Thought* is here presented to the public by a pupil and admirer, who is himself well qualified to judge of the work of one whose life was given to religious instruction. The volume is of moderate size, and introduces the reader very sympathetically into the home-life, the class-room and the literary labors of its subject. Dr. Slattery thinks that Professor Allen was best as a teacher, and this may well be so, judging from the many incidents he narrates and the testimonies he cites. But the book reveals to us more than a teacher, and its chief excellence will be, we venture to think, that here we have the portrait of an American Broad Churchman.

The impression that the biography leaves is that Professor Allen was a man of wide rather than particular interests, a scholar fond of generalizations and careless of detail. He defends Froude for this. It is interesting to see, and it is the merit of the book that it gives us a sufficiently full and vivid account to see, how a New England environment, evangelical parents, a democracy of churches, semi-schisms in his own denomination, and anti-supernaturalism all about worked on a sensitive poetical nature, that could not but remain true to the democracy of its home, or give up the protestantism in which it was nurtured, and resulted in a thorough-going Realism, centering in the Incarnation, and almost unmindful of ought else in Christianity, dominating all his thought.

But Dr. Slattery does not discuss Professor Allen's theology and neither will we. The reader will find much of interest in the account of young Allen's early home life in a New England rectory, and enjoy the older man's estimates of contemporary events and persons both in America and abroad. There are a portrait, several illustration and an index.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT. Being the Donnellan Lectures Before the University of Dublin. By F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, B.D., Formerly Scholar and University Student. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. 1911. Pp. 343.

In giving a brief account and criticism of Mr. Hitchcock's Donnellan Lectures on the Atonement, it will not be necessary to make any detailed statement of the contents of the book. For although there are twelve chapters in the volume, there is little, if any, advance in the thought. The same ideas are repeated, the only difference between

the various chapters being that the Atonement is viewed from a different angle or standpoint in each chapter.

In their polemic aspect these lectures are written chiefly as a protest against the Satisfaction doctrine of the Atonement. Mr. Hitchcock seems never to grow weary of repeating that the Atonement is not "transactional", and not "substitutive", and not "forensic", and that the guilt and punishment of man's sin was not borne by Christ as the sinner's substitute. In his criticism, moreover, Mr. Hitchcock at times betrays a complete failure to comprehend the meaning of the view which he is attacking, as, for example, when he rejects the idea of the imputation of the sinner's guilt to Christ, and of Christ's righteousness to the sinner, on the ground that the "transfer of morality" is impossible. It would seem that such confusion of thought ought to be inexcusable, especially in view of the countless number of exposures of this misapprehension of the doctrine of Imputation which have been made since the time when Socinus made use of it. Furthermore, in seeking to eliminate the Satisfaction doctrine from the Scripture, the author appears to follow a mixed method. Jesus' words about His blood as Covenant blood are not ascribed by Mr. Hitchcock to the influence of Paul upon the evangelist, but are said to be a "concession" on the part of Jesus to current modes of thought. But not the slightest evidence is given in support of this statement. Paul's statements, on the other hand, are not explained as examples of the influence of Jewish theology, but a method of minimizing exegesis is followed to rob them of their natural meaning, which method of interpretation in the case of 2 Cor. v. 21, and similar passages, becomes so arbitrary and so evidently governed by dogmatic considerations, as to be devoid of any scientific validity.

Turning to the author's own view of the Atonement, it may be described as eclectic. The idea of "vicarious penitence" (p. 117) is employed somewhat after the fashion of McLeod Campbell. No attempt, however, is made to show how the sinless Jesus could possibly show penitence for sin, since He was entirely free from it, as Mr. Hitchcock repeatedly asserts. In another place an idea of the Atonement similar to that of "salvation by sample" is expressed (p. 115) in an attempt to explain the way by which Christ's death atones for man's sin. At other times the Cross of Christ is said to manifest the holiness of God in very much the same way as in those theories of the Atonement which the late Prof. Stevens characterized as "ethicized governmentalism" (p. 147)). Mr. Hitchcock's characteristic and fundamental view of the Atonement, however, is expressed by the words "immanence" and "identification". God is immanent in humanity; the Incarnation is an "intensification" of this immanence, and the Atonement is "a principal phase in the evolution of God in humanity". Christ so "identified" Himself with humanity that "in Christ's death the race died", *i. e.*, died to sin (p. 193). But no explanation whatever is given of how this was so or how it could be, or what possible connection

Christ's death had with human sin. The "identification" of Christ with the race is explicitly said by Mr. Hitchcock to be, not with the sin of the race, but with its "sadness and sorrows". In consequence of this, Christ is said to have "felt" God's judgment against sin, and thus to have "conquered it in Himself". All this, however, is quite unintelligible. If the guilt of man's sin was not imputed to Christ, and, if in assuming a human nature in the Incarnation, Christ did not assume human nature conceived as a whole and as sinful, it is inconceivable what relation His death could have had to man's sin.

Mr. Hitchcock apparently wishes to state the view of Christ's saving work which supposes that by His Incarnation He purified human nature potentially for all men and conquered sin in His flesh; but Mr. Hitchcock is unwilling to allow the presupposition of this view, viz., that Christ assumed in His Incarnation, not a human nature, but generic human nature regarded as sinful. Consequently Mr. Hitchcock seems to be in hopeless confusion whenever he tries to explain the relation of Christ and His saving work to human sin.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE. A STUDY IN THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.

By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D. Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. Pp. 216.

This is a popular outline of some of the main ideas of Christian Eschatology, limiting itself chiefly to the idea of Immortality. Dr. Brown begins by stating what he conceives to be the "permanent content" of the Christian hope. This hope is first, individualistic, *i. e.*, it involves the survival of the individual personality after death in a conscious state; secondly, it is social, *i. e.*, it includes the idea of a society of individuals or a Kingdom of God; thirdly, it is a religious hope, *i. e.*, it is a hope of fellowship with God and Christ.

Having given a brief statement of the nature of the Christian hope as he conceives it, Dr. Brown proceeds in the second part of the volume to give a history of the early conceptions of the future life. These, he says, have assumed three forms—that of a life on this earth in a resurrection body; that of a life of moral distinctions in an underworld; and that of a purely disembodied existence or the philosophical conception of Immortality. After tracing the rise of the Idea of Immortality in India and Greece, the author outlines the Old Testament idea of the future life, and then proceeds to discuss the contribution which Jesus made to the Christian hope by His teaching, personality, and especially by His resurrection. This is followed by a chapter which states the "chief historic forms of the Christian hope"—Pre-millenarianism, Purgatory, and the idea of "instant sanctification at death", finding elements of truth and of error in each of these ideas. The decline of faith in personal immortality and the modern substitutes for it, are next discussed, and this section closes with a chapter

on the recovery of faith in Immortality, stating the main extra-Biblical arguments which have been urged for it.

The volume closes with a constructive section in which Dr. Brown states the content of the Christian hope, the grounds upon which it rests, and its value for the individual and society. In giving his idea of the nature of the Christian hope, Dr. Brown simply expands the three above-mentioned ideas of the first chapter concerning its "permanent content".

At the end of the volume a selected bibliography is given, which, while it makes no attempt at being exhaustive, is valuable because it gives very many of the best works on the Ethnic Faiths and on Christian Eschatology.

Dr. Brown's little volume is written in a clear and attractive style, and shows a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject. There are some points, however, which are open to criticism, and we mention one or two of these in closing.

One important point is the subsumption of the revelation of God in the Old Testament and the teaching of Jesus, under the "historical" section which traces the rise and progress of religious thought concerning the future life. The implication of this is that the Old Testament conception of the future, and also that of Jesus, are but stages in the natural development of human religious thought. But Dr. Brown nowhere in this volume affirms this, much less does he attempt to give any grounds for such a view. On the other hand, if the Bible contains a supernatural revelation, and if, therefore, its teaching is authoritative, it should be given a special place as the basis for the author's constructive statement, which statement, as a matter of fact, assumes too free an attitude toward the Scripture teaching, upon the assumption of its supernatural character. In a word, Dr. Brown's somewhat free attitude toward the Scripture doctrine is without adequate principal grounding.

Another main defect in the volume is its obscurity and vagueness upon the question of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. After reading this chapter carefully, one is in doubt whether Dr. Brown believes in the bodily resurrection of Jesus and does not like to say so, or whether he does not believe in it and does not like to say so. He is quite explicit in asserting the necessity for belief in Christ's resurrection and its essential place in Christianity. Moreover, he seems to assert that the Resurrection of Jesus means more than the immortality of Jesus' soul. And yet Dr. Brown seems entirely uncertain whether the body of Jesus which was laid in the tomb really rose, and asserts in so many words that "the fact for faith is the continued existence and supremacy of Jesus, and this is a fact in the realm of spirit" (p. 104). This statement would seem to imply that the bodily resurrection of Christ is a matter of no importance after all, which is quite contrary to the view of the New Testament. Dr. Brown asserts that "any interpretation" of the facts recorded in the Gospels which is consist-

ent with belief in Christ's continued supremacy, is sufficient. But this is simply avoiding the issue and playing with words. Jesus either rose from the dead, in which case of course His resurrection was bodily, or else He did not rise, in which case the most that can be asserted is the immortality of His human soul, and then our whole conception of the nature of Christianity will be quite contrary to that of Christ and His Apostles. This attempt of Dr. Brown to mediate between the supernaturalism of the Christianity of the New Testament and the naturalism of modern thought is a complete failure, as every such attempt must always be.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PAUL IN EVERYDAY LIFE. By JOHN DOUGLAS ADAM, D.D. New York: Association Press. Cloth; 16mo; pp. 235. Price 50 cents.

The Epistles of Paul are here divided into brief paragraphs designed for daily devotional use during a period of forty-four weeks. Each group of verses is followed by a short comment to aid in the interpretation, to guide the meditation, and to suggest the personal application. To many of the comments brief prayers are appended.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY ADULT CLASS AT WORK. Edited by John T. Faris. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. Paper; pp. 38. Price 10 cents.

No department of the Sabbath-School Work has surpassed the Adult Class in recent development and in manifest importance. This booklet contains many valuable suggestions for those interested in this sphere of religious activity.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

MILLENNIAL DAWNISM. By I. M. HALDEMAN, D.D. Published by Chas. C. Cook, New York. Pp. 80. Price 10 cents.

This is a severe arraignment of a popular and perilous combination of truth and error, of Christian doctrines and antichristian heresies.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

TRUE EVANGELISM. By LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER. New York: Gospel Publishing House. 12 mo; cloth; pp. 157. Price 50 cents.

The particular value of this discussion lies in the emphasis which is rightly placed upon the divine factors in evangelistic work. The writer warns against the peril of confusing evangelism with any mere evangelistic methods, and lays stress upon the convicting power of the Spirit, upon the necessary instrumentality of the inspired word, upon the power of prayer, and upon the requisite consecration and holiness of the evangelistic workers.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH. By J. WILBUR CUAPMAN, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 12 mo; cloth; pp. 180. Price 50 cents net.

These pages, by a great Evangelist, embody an inspiring appeal to undertake the winning of souls for Christ by the exercise of personal influence. The necessary preparation of the worker, the possibility of influencing the young, and the power of Christian faith are all presented with abundant illustrations which give to the message a deep human interest.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. By the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Wycliffe College, Toronto. Hodder and Stoughton: London, New York, Toronto. Cloth; 12 mo; pp. 432.

This comprehensive volume covers almost the whole field of practical theology, and treats not only the art of preaching but the life and work of the preacher. It is distinguished by its Biblical character, its practical helpfulness, and its good judgment. As it deals with so large a number of topics, the treatment is necessarily concise; but it abounds in illustrations, and is not without occasional touches of humor.

Every portion of the book emphasizes the need of high personal character, but this is particularly the theme of *Part One* which treats "The Man" as suggested by the Old Testament prophets, the New Testament disciples, the ministry and pastoral epistles of Paul.

Part Two deals with "The Work" of the ministry, including preaching, visitation, Bible-classes, missions, prayer-meetings, social work and personal work.

In *Part Three*, "The Man" is considered "in relation to the Work" by following out the description of "Evangelist" as pictured by Bunyan, and by suggesting certain spiritual "essentials of a competent ministry".

While one-fourth of the volume is designed more specially for ministers of the Anglican Church, and contains definite reference to the Prayer Book, even this portion, hardly less than the remainder of the book, will be found of true helpfulness to all who have been called to "the work of the ministry".

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

SOUTH AMERICAN PROBLEMS. By ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D. Senior Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. New York: Student Volunteer Movement. Cloth; 16 mo; pp. 265. Price 75 cents.

Any literary work undertaken by Dr. Speer is certain to be characterized by strength, clearness, originality and moral earnestness. In addition to his long familiarity with the missionary stations of our own

church, Dr. Speer was specially prepared for this present task by a recent extended tour through the Republics whose problems he here discusses. The past and present of these Republics are first reviewed, and then the two great problems are considered, the problem of education and the problem of religion.

In spite of the educational systems which have been established in Argentina, Chile, Brazil and Uruguay, and which have many commendable features, the illiteracy of these countries is surprising, while in the less advanced nations of South America it is almost incredible.

The illiteracy is less startling, however, than the irreligion. This is the second and supreme problem; it is closely related to the first; and both are due to the domination and influence of the Roman Catholic Church. The attitude of the writer toward this church is peculiarly generous, kindly and sympathetic; but as this church exists and operates in South America, it is held directly responsible for appalling social immorality for illiteracy and ignorance, for a corrupt priesthood, for denying to the people access to the Bible, for teaching the worship of Mary instead of faith in Christ, for abounding and degrading idolatry and superstition and for a disastrous confusion of religion with politics. This arraignment of the Roman Church is justified by the quotations from abundant authorities and witnesses, and is followed by chapters dealing with the South American Indians, and with the work of Protestant Missions. "*Are such missions warranted*"; this is the great question, with which the discussion closes. An affirmative answer is supported by a consideration of the facts already adduced concerning the Roman Catholic Church. In spite of the certain and inevitable opposition of this church, it is urged that the work should be continued in a spirit which is irenic, sympathetic and hopeful.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE CHINESE REVOLUTION. By the Rev. ARTHUR J. BROWN, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. New York: Student Volunteer Movement. Cloth; illustrated; 16 mo; pp. 217. Price 75 cents net.

No events of modern history are of larger significance to the world than the sudden awakening and reconstruction of China. The recent political revolution, which has resulted in the establishment of the "Great Chinese Republic", is but one, if the most surprising, of these developments. Its causes and occasions are more or less familiar in the Western world; yet the former reach far back into the last century, and the latter have not been perfectly clear as set forth in the popular press. All intelligent readers will be gratified to find in this volume by Doctor Brown a popular but illuminating discussion of this recent and important national movement. The author visited China in 1901 and again in 1908, and has for years been a careful student of Chinese affairs; he therefore writes with a true breadth of vision and an evident familiarity with the great facts under consideration. The

style is characteristically bright and attractive. The message of the volume is a strong appeal to the Church of Christ to accept an opportunity actually unprecedented, and to undertake, in the wide evangelization of China, a work of incomparable importance. Among the chapters one of the most interesting is that which contains brief sketches of Yuan Shi Kai, and Sun Yat Sen. The titles of the chapters will suggest the general content of the book. They are as follows: Outbreak and Background of the Revolution; The Transformations Wrought by Steam and Commerce; Diplomatic Relations and growth of Political Unrest; Intellectual Awakening and Educational Progress; Quickening and Constructive Influence of Social Reforms; Leaders of the New China; The Future of the Republic.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

WHAT I TELL MY JUNIOR CONGREGATION. By the Rev. ROBINSON P. D. BENNETT, M. A. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. Cloth; 16 mo; pp. 173.

Any suggestion is most welcome which aims at solving the problem of the relation of children to the church. This little book cannot fail to be of aid in this vital matter. It is not the work of a theorist, but comes from one who for several years was State Secretary of Junior Christian Endeavor in the State of New Jersey, and who, during his successful pastorate in Germantown, has actually preached to the Junior Congregation of Summit Presbyterian Church the sermons contained in this interesting volume.

These sermons, as printed, are prefaced by an "Introduction" from the pen of the Rev. Alexander Henry, D.D., and by four chapters dealing with "The Motive", "The Mission", "The Method", and "The Message" for the Junior Congregation. The sermons, while concise and picturesque, are not wanting in dignity and point. The volume is commended to all who are entrusted with the difficult work of the Christian pastorate.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE PRESENCE. By JAMES M. CAMPBELL, D.D. New York: Eaton and Mains. Cloth; 12mo; pp. 232. Price, \$1.00 net.

Here is a message for the heart, a reminder of the stimulating and transforming truth of the continual presence of a personal God. Unfortunately, however, the writer mars his work, and decreases his influence, by plunging into the field of controversy. It is to be regretted, both because this part of his task was so unnecessary, and because it has been so poorly done. Even the spirit is hardly to be commended which asserts that, in differing from the author, "the apostles", the early church, "the critics" and "the commentators" have all been mistaken. In attempting to prove that the Second Advent occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem, the startling conclusions are intimated (1) that for forty years following Pentecost the church did not have the real, personal presence of Christ, and (2) that Christians who look for

a future glorious manifestation of Christ must necessarily deny the present invisible presence of their Lord. Those who are cherishing the "blessed hope of the appearing of the Savior" most certainly believe in his spiritual and personal presence, and they are grateful to those who, like this author, aid them in more fully realizing this truth. In presenting his theme the writer treats of the divine presence as "veiled in nature," "localized in the Old Testament," "visualized in the incarnation," "spiritualized in the resurrection," "universalized by the Holy Spirit," "operative now in saving, healing, comforting, judging, reigning." When the writer turns from the polemical to the devotional treatment of his theme, and confines himself to its simpler and more familiar aspects, he is stimulating and helpful. For instance, no one could read his chapters on "The Recognition of the Presence," and "The Practice of the Presence," without recognizing anew the nearness of our living, divine, Lord.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE PASTOR HIS OWN EVANGELIST. By the F. M. Barton Company, Cleveland, Ohio. Cloth; 8vo; pp. 477.

A great service has been rendered by the preparation of this volume. As Dr. Chapman indicates in a prefatory note, it is not intended to imply that the work of special evangelists is not needed, or that pastors cannot helpfully assist one another in special services; but the book emphasizes the fact that each pastor should undertake definite evangelistic work in his own church and parish. The book opens with a chapter by Dr. Goodell, which offers suggestions as to the preparation for a revival. The remainder of the book contains directions for the conduct of eighteen special services. In the case of each service, texts are given for particular themes, followed by certain outlines for sermons upon these texts. Suggestions are then given for the efficient conduct of the service. Then "seed thoughts" are furnished in connection with the theme of the service. And lastly, illustrations are given bearing upon the special message which the service is designed to impress. The book is not intended to be a crutch on which the minister is to lean, but rather as a suggestive guide and an inspiring helper. The present edition of the book is the third which has appeared, and it is easy to understand both the popularity of the book and the help it is said to have given to the many pastors who have used it in arranging special services. The suggestions which the book contains are practical. The subjects are well adapted for a series of evangelistic services, and the illustrations are vivid and modern. The book is to be cordially commended to all pastors who desire help in more faithfully accomplishing their work as evangelists.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE ANALYZED BIBLE. By the Rev. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.
Cloth; 12 mo; pp. 307, 280. Price, \$1.00 each.

It is a pleasure to welcome these two additional volumes of "The Analyzed Bible." As the name clearly indicates, these are comprehensive outlines of the respective books of scripture. The comments upon each section are necessarily brief, but serve to indicate the connection, and usually the main points of the teaching. They express the genius of the author for illuminating analysis, and his firm conviction in the authority and integrity of the Bible.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

LIVING MESSAGES OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Cloth; 12mo; pp. 282. Price, \$1.00 net.

This is the first of three volumes which are to be quite distinct from the series of the "Analyzed Bible" published by the same author. The design of this work is to give the living messages to our own time of the Books of the Bible. This first volume treats the Books from Genesis to Esther. Each discussion sets forth the underlying principles or "permanent values" of the Book, and then states its practical application or "living message". The author reveals his grasp of the central truths, but also the vital importance of the ancient scriptures for the present age.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

ROMANS I-V. By the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D. Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Wycliffe College, Toronto. The Religious Tract Society of London. Cloth; pp. 215; Crown; 8vo; price, two shillings.

This is in every particular an admirable volume, and is far above the level of most devotional commentaries. The latter are too far characterized by careless exegesis and pious platitudes. Here we have a serious piece of work indicating at once careful scholarship and spiritual insight. While the continual aim is to secure a message for the heart and the life, the basis of the appeal is found in an accurate exposition of the inspired Epistle. The striking features are clearness and conciseness. The analysis of the book is illuminating and satisfying, and in the treatment of each section of the five chapters under discussion, after an explanatory introduction and outline, there follow an interpretation of the passage and closing "suggestions for meditation". While the author quotes largely from standard commentaries to which he gives full credit, the extracts suggest a familiarity with the literature of the subject, and are used to enforce the argument, but do not mar the unity of the thought. The devotional suggestions indicate a special aptitude for practical application. Readers will await with interest the two remaining volumes of this helpful commentary.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

ROMANS VI-XI. A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY. By the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature

and Exegesis, Wycliffe College, Toronto. London: The Religious Tract Society. Large crown 8vo; pp. 235. Price 2 shillings.

This second volume of the series fully meets the expectation awakened by the first, and merits the same high praise. It is characterized by careful exegesis, spiritual insight, and definite application. While traversing passages which for ages have been the battlefields of theologians, the spirit is never controversial and the immediate and continual aim is practical.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

ONE HUNDRED PRAYER MEETING TALKS AND PLANS. By F. M. BARTON, Cleveland, Ohio. Cloth; 8vo; pp. 544. Price, \$2.00.

Any effort to arouse new interest and to add increased vigor to the church prayer meeting should be cordially welcomed. This volume cannot fail to assist in such a movement. It opens with a brief introductory note by the Rev. F. B. Meyer, of London, suggesting the possible power of the church prayer meeting. Then follow one hundred brief suggestions for the conduct of the mid-week service of prayer. A number of testimonies are added from pastors who have in greater or less degree solved the serious problems which are related to the mid-week service. All this consumes but thirty pages. The remaining five hundred pages of the volume are devoted to the twelve hundred illustrations which are appended to the brief outlines suggested for one hundred and four prayer meeting talks. These topics are divided into two portions. The first series relate to various problems of Christian life. The second are drawn from the life of Christ as contained in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus material is suggested for two complete years of mid-week services. It is possibly to be regretted that so large a mass of illustrative material has been introduced, as the price of the volume must be necessarily high. It might have been better to have published the brief suggestions relative to the prayer meeting, and to have appended the material for a few typical services. However, if judiciously used, and not employed to escape proper labor, these outlines and illustrations will be of great service to the average pastor.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

IDEALS AND PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH REFORM. By the Rev. J. C. BARRY, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth; 12 mo; pp. 206. Price \$1.25 net.

In his introductory note to this important volume, written shortly before the sudden and lamented death of the author, Professor James Denny very truly suggests that while the problem of Christian unity is exciting such wide interest and is being so earnestly discussed, many advocates of various programmes seem to have little idea of the principles involved or even of the true ideal to be attained; and he intimates that the assumptions so unreflectingly made by such "advocates of union" will be rudely shaken when they come face to face with the real problems which their theories imply or which must be met before any plan can be consummated.

With some of these fundamental ideals and principles Mr. Barry dealt most seriously in his thoughtful discussion. In his first chapter he showed that the popular ideal of "amalgamation into one society, with a central government, of churches now in existence", is really Roman Catholic, in contrast with the Protestant ideal of one Spiritual Society including an indefinite number of independent, self-governing societies, the condition of membership being submission to Jesus Christ as Lord. In his second chapter he showed that the latter was The Unity of the Primitive Church; and in the third chapter he argued that the only true Christian union will be attained by a reconstruction, on this primitive model, which will result in a voluntary federation of independent, self-governing, local churches. In his concluding chapters he contended that a true Spiritual Unity was as little dependent upon Doctrinal Unanimity as upon Uniformity in Organization, but that its manifestation in such local federations would result in the growth and efficiency of the Church and more specifically in the accomplishment of its social mission. Whether one may accept or reject the conclusions of the writer, he will agree with the statement of Mr. Denny that one "cannot enter without profit into this discussion of the fundamental questions" of Christian Unity.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

GOD'S BALANCE OF FAITH AND FREEDOM. By the Reverend LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Company. Cloth; pp. 144. Price \$1.50 net.

These four lectures, delivered at the Berkley Divinity School on the Mary Fitch Page Foundation, deal in an original and interesting way with the great problems of religious liberty and authority, of freedom and faith. By "faith" the author intends to denote those essentials of a supernatural revelation that are summarized in "The Nicene Creed", and "The Apostles' Creed". With this "faith", "once for all delivered to the saints", in mind, the history of the Christian Church is reviewed to show how the Church has kept, or failed to keep, the divine balance between freedom and faith. The history is accordingly divided into three periods: *first*, "The Age of Simple Reception", extending to the end of the third Christian century; *second*, "The Age of Dogmatism", extending to the time of the Reformation, but divided into two portions, the former, continuing until A. D. 800, in which the Church unselfishly safeguards the revealed faith, and the latter continuing to A.D. 1500, in which she selfishly and tyrannically safeguards her own human theology; *third*, the modern "Age of Individualism", a period of disintegration and confusion, leading through uncertainty to agnosticism. By such a review of history, the author emphasizes the supreme need of restoring and maintaining a true balance between the few articles of fixed and necessary belief, and the large field of speculative thought, and theological statement. He shows the peril of a tyrannical dogmatism on the one hand, and, on the other, of a rationalism which holds nothing to be infallibly true. In the present sense of failure, in the demand

for Christian brotherhood, in a growing interest in the history of the Church, are found "signs of hope" that there will be discovered the necessary synthesis of authority and liberty, of faith and freedom.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

A CHRISTIAN'S HABITS. By ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press. 12mo; 114 pp. Price 50 cents.

The treatment of any theme by Dr. Speer is certain to be marked by clearness, originality and deep moral earnestness. Such are the characteristics of these fourteen brief chapters which deal with the laws of spiritual and mental habit as applied to the Christian life. The messages are especially designed for the young, and suggest the need and the possibility of cultivating the habits of prayer, of right thinking, of prompt doing, of wise spending, of decision, of finding and following the will of God.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

THE ROMANCE OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By JOHN T. FARIS. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 63 pp.; 12 mo. Price 25 cents.

This is one of the most brief but not the least important of the long list of discussions called forth by the tercentenary of the publication of the King James Version. It recounts concisely most of the salient points in the fascinating history of the English versions, even glancing at the story of the early manuscripts and concluding with references to the revision of 1881-1885 and to the preparation of the American Standard Edition. The little book can hardly fail to realize the hope of the writer which is to lead the reader to inquire for some of the more ambitious volumes in which the story is more fully told.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

WELFARE WORK OF CORPORATIONS. By MARY LATHROP GOSS. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. Paper; 12 mo; pp. 36. Price 10 cents net.

In discussing the various activities designed by employers to improve the circumstances of workmen, the writer traces the origin of the general movement to Germany and especially to the steel works of Frederick Krupp & Co., at Essen. The special provision for physical safety and comfort, the opportunity for recreation, the educational advantages, the provision of suitable homes, the establishment of provident funds and pensions, in short, all the efforts which are commonly classed under the term of Welfare Work are here illustrated in the provisions made by certain great corporations both in America and abroad.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

WITH YOU ALWAYS. A Sequel to "Over Against the Treasury". By COURTENAY H. FENN, D.D., Missionary of the Presbyterian Board,

Peking, China. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1911
12mo; pp. 238; 75 cents net.

"After the Convention comes the Campaign." As a sequel to his now celebrated missionary plea, "Over Against the Treasury", Dr. Fenn gives this imaginative account of the practical results that may confidently be expected in any church, when its officers and members thoroughly appropriate the promise of the presence of the living Christ. It is an instructive and entertaining description of ways and means that may be used for the conduct of an effective campaign for home and foreign missions.

An introductory chapter, giving a resumé of the earlier volume, furnishes the present story its setting. The Rev. John Stanton, the pastor of the Westminster Church of Jaronsett, had, in lieu of a sermon on the Sunday morning devoted to the annual offering for foreign missions, told his people of a remarkable dream he had had the night before, in which he beheld the Lord sitting "Over against the treasury" and observing the gifts of the contributors. The members of the congregation were then asked to come again in the evening and to make their offering under the influence of the conviction that Jesus Christ was as really present as though seen with the eyes of the flesh. The amazing results are here tabulated in ten chapters. Seven of these sketch the realization of an adequate missionary programme along the lines of the "Seven Characteristic Features of the Standard Missionary Church", so much emphasized by the Laymen's Missionary Movement, while the remaining three chapters deal with the supplementary topics: "A Missionary Session", "A Parish Abroad", and "Definite Prayer and Effort to Secure Volunteers".

The developments are somewhat too idealistically sketched to produce the maximum of verisimilitude; especially does the time seem too limited for the marvellous transportation of this staid and spiritually lethargic church. Nevertheless, as the author reminds us, we dare never call this ideal impracticable, since it is none other than that presented by our Lord himself as the true task of the kingdom.

The book ought to be read by every pastor. It cannot fail to inspire him to greater faith, courage and perseverance in developing the missionary spirit and service of his people. And it is even more to be hoped that this commanding presentation concerning the great cause of missions may find its way into the hands and hearts of many of our church members who are nigh unto perishing for lack of the vision of the living Lord and for their failure to obey his will with respect to the unevangelized nations of to-day.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

MORAL LEADERSHIP AND THE MINISTRY. By EDWARD E. KEEDY, Author of "The Naturalness of Christian Life". Boston: Horace Worth Company. 1912. 12mo; pp. vii, 200.

With great force and charm of style the writer discusses this sub-

ject from the following points of view: religion as the ground or source of leadership; the spirit of leadership; religion as the equipment for leadership; the ministry; loss of leadership; the power to constrain or lead; the leader's program; the training for leadership. As to substance of thought, there is little new in this volume: the main idea is that loyalty to Jesus Christ in daily life yields the superior type of character that alone is fitted for moral leadership. But many an old truth of fundamental importance to the minister of the Gospel is here set forth with such simplicity, beauty and compelling power that one feels himself alternately filled with a noble discontent with his past attainments and with stern resolves to make the life of trust in, and devotion to, Christ a more influential reality.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

A WAY OF HONOR AND OTHER COLLEGE SERMONS. By HENRY KINGMAN, D.D. Fleming Revell Company. 1911. 8vo, pp. 210.

These fourteen sermons were delivered by the author in the Congregational Church of Claremont, California, in which the congregation is made up largely of the students of Pomona College. The discourses make much of Christ's character and influence upon his followers, and put the chief stress upon the ethical teachings of the Gospel. Simple in style, affluent in illustrative material, and strong in their hortatory appeals, they are rather loose in structure, and vague in their didactic elements. Prevailing topical in the method of development, they commonly present but a few of the many phases of truth suggested by the unrestricted forms of most of the themes proposed for discussion.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

SOME OF GOD'S MINISTERS. By WILLIAM MALCOLM MACGREGOR, D.D., St. Andrew's United Free Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1910. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. 8vo; pp. x, 297. \$1.75 net.

The substance, diction, style, and masterful technique of these sermons make them exceedingly interesting, suggestive, and spiritually helpful. It is one of the best volumes of this kind that we have had occasion to review during the year. Dr. Macgregor is a preacher of great power. His messages deserve a large number of readers, and his homiletic methods may be studied with profit by every minister who desires to perfect himself in the art of preaching the Word.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

RHYTHMISCHER CHORAL, ALTARWEISEN UND GRIECHISCHE RHYTHMEN, in ihrem Wesen dargestellt durch eine Rhythmik des einstimmigen Gesanges auf Grund der Accente: von FRIEDRICH SUCCO, Pastor. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1906.

We are presented here with a portly tome of four hundred and five

pages on the highly specific subject of rhythm in special relation to congregational singing. The author begins by making a number of interesting comments on the present noteworthy and deplorable degradation of congregational singing in Germany, especially in North Germany. Germany has historically a noble heritage alike in her hymnology and in the musical "Choral", which at its perfection represents an unexcelled type of music for congregational worship, but the pronouncement in this book by a native German confirms the experience of keen disillusionment which was experienced by the present reviewer when a previous mental idealization of German congregational praise was dissipated by the discovery of its present-day degeneracy, as shown by the exceedingly limited number of tunes with which the congregations are at all acquainted, and the dragged-out and dismal singing, with rare exceptions, even of those few that are ever sung.

Pastor Succo has placed his finger, we believe, upon one, at least, of the causes of this, when he attributes it not to the people having lost in any degree their old-time enjoyment of united popular song, secular and sacred, in church and home; or yet altogether to the introduction in many Christian circles of "die von England aus importierten wertlosen und zum teil direkt schädlichen" hymns and tunes (of the type perpetrated by the modern popular evangelists, which, however useful in their place, do certainly not find their place in the church's regular Sabbath services of praise); but to the great degradation of the noble "Choral" type through ignorance and neglect, on the part of organists and choir leaders, of the nature and principles of rhythm.

The volume before us is an exhaustive, and to all appearance, scholarly and accurate discussion of the entire matter of rhythm, beginning with an historical investigation of the little known but genetically fundamental principles of the music of classical, especially Greek, antiquity, in which rhythm was far more prominent and its principles probably even more highly developed than in any modern music. This introductory chapter is a monograph which should have independent value for the classical scholar. The author's main intention, however, throughout, is the practical one, of seeking to redeem the German "Choral" to its noble past and to its still nobler undeveloped potentialities of the future, and thus to elevate and vitalize, and indeed new-create, the church's service of praise in his native land. How far this particular work will contribute to the aim desired may be uncertain, but there is no doubt that, in English-speaking churches as well, the study and application of fundamental principles of accent and rhythm to the music of the sanctuary deserves such an attention, which at present it fails to receive.

Carlisle, Pa.

EDWIN HENRY KELLOGG.

THE RECOVERY OF THE HOME. By CHARLES F. THWING, D.D., President Western Reserve University. Published for the Social Service Commission of the Northern Baptist Convention. 8vo. pp. 24.

American Baptist Publication Society: Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Toronto, Can. 1912. Price, 10 cents net.

This is an admirable little pamphlet, as true as it is timely, by the well known author of the classic work in English on *The Family*.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, July: J. WARSCHAUER, Present Position of Liberal Theology in Great Britain; JAMES W. THOMPSON, Alleged Persecution of Christians at Lyons in 177; W. K. WRIGHT, Psychological Definition of Religion; HUGH R. MACKINTOSH, The Liberal Conception of Jesus in its Strength and its Weakness; THEODORE SOARES, Practical Theology and Ministerial Efficiency.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Oberlin, July: A. TROELSTRA, Organic Unity of the Old Testament; W. H. G. THOMAS, Reasonable Biblical Criticism; G. MARGOLIOUTH, Sadducean Christians of Damascus; EDWARD M. MERRINS, Ministry of Pain (II); HAROLD M. WIENER, Two New Volumes in the International Critical Commentary; DAVID F. BONNER, Christianity and the Industrial Problem; EDUARD F. KÖNIG, History of the Religion of Israel and its Newer Representation; HOWELL M. HAYDN, Paul's Transformation in Character.

Church Quarterly Review, London, July: ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, John Henry Newman; C. H. TURNER, Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Burial; WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln; C. J. SHEBBEARE, Probabilism; C. A. BRIGGS, Symbolics and Irenics; GERALD S. DAVIES, Charterhouse in London; C. F. BURNEY, New Aramaic Papyri and Old Testament History; ARTHUR OGLE, Liberal Churchmen and the Welsh Bill.

East & West, London, July: HARRY JOHNSTON, Value to the World of Christian Missions; CHARLES HALDON, Foreign Missions and English Literature; BISHOP GIBSON, Training of South African Missionaries; C. F. ANDREWS, King's Visit to Delhi; R. M. WEITBRECHT, Language Study from a Missionary Standpoint; SUSAN BALLARD, Buddhist monastery in Japan; T. P. GEORGE, Land of wood and water (Jamaica); CANON RIVINGTON, An Indian village Cult; Service abroad, by one who has tried it; Indian Religious census, by the Editor.

Expositor, London, September: ERSKINE HILL, Apocalyptic Element in our Lord's Teaching; H. A. A. KENNEDY, St. Paul and the Terminology of the Mystery-Religions; JAMES STALKER, Studies in Conversion. 8. Chalmers; JOHN OMAN, Personality and Grace. 9. Justification; ARTHUR CARR, The Indwelling Trinity; W. J. CUNNINGHAM PIKE, The Angels at the Empty Tomb: A Study in Synoptics; W. M. RAMSAY, Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, August: Notes of Recent Exposition; C. ANDERSON SCOTT, The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul; PAUL FEINE, Positive Theological Research in Germany; A. E.

GARVIE, Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds; JAMES STRAHAN, Gospel of Hosea.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, September: Notes of Recent Exposition; R. M. LITHGOW, The Minor Parables, the Metaphors, and the Similies of the Synoptic Gospels; A. E. GARVIE, Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds; C. ANDERSON SCOTT, The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, July: RUDOLF EUCKEN, What is Driving Men To-day Back to Religion?; GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD, Is Faith in God Decadent?; DANIEL EVANS, Divine Revelation and the Christian Religion; BENJAMIN W. BACON, The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper; JAMES DE NORMANDIE, John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians; JOHN E. LE BOSQUET, The Evil one:—a Development; WILLARD L. SPERRY, Eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels: its Fidelity to Religious Experience.

Hibbert Journal, Boston and London, July: MAX NORDAU, Degeneration of Classes and Peoples; C. G. MONTEFIORE, Significance of Jesus for His Own Age; R. KENNARD DAVIS, Christ as "The Truth"; BISHOP OF TASMANIA, The Church, the World, and the Kingdom; A. W. F. BLUNT, The Ungodly Organization of Society; E. W. LUMMIS, Conformity and Veracity: 1662 and 1912; M. M. PATTISON, Vain Appeal of Dogma to Science; PHILIP E. B. JOURDAIN, Logic, M. Bergson, and H. G. Wells; E. F. CARRITT, Artistic Attitude in Conduct; G. E. FRENCH, Interpretation of Prophecy; ARCHIBALD A. BOWMAN, Sistine Madonna; B. A. G. FULLER, Gods of Epicurus; EMMA MAHLER, Hardships of Seamen's Wives.

Homiletic Review, New York, September: F. W. BUTLER, Primacy of the Moral in Religious Life and Thought; CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, Men and Religion Forward Movement—Its Significance and Duration; GEORGE W. GILMORE, Primitive Religious Phenomena—Totemism and Taboo; ROBSON BLACK, What the Stage Can Teach the Preacher; WILLIAM DURBAN, Comment and Outlook from Abroad; CLAYTON S. COOPER, Outlook in Egypt.

International Journal of Ethics, Philadelphia, July: SOPHIE BRYANT, Many-Sidedness of Moral Education; IRA W. HOWERTH, Competition, Natural and Industrial; A. K. ROGERS, Rights of Man; WILLIAM A. ROSS, Ethical Basis of Calvinism; F. CARREL, Present Attitude.

Interpreter, London, July: W. EMERY BARNES, Religion of St. Bernard; DR. COOKE, Was Deuteronomy Written in Cuneiform; CANON KENNETT, Development of the Apocalyptic Style in the Old Testament; A. W. F. BLUNT, The Way of the Cross; E. G. KING, Covenant of Creation in the Psalms; ARTHUR DAKIN, St. Paul's Success at Athens.

Irish Theological Quarterly, Dublin and New York, July: MATTHEW A. POWER, Who Were They Who "Understood Not"?; J. KELLEHER, Genesis of Present Industrial Conditions; E. J. CULLEN, Validation of Marriage; J. GHELLINCK, Theological Literature during the Investiture Struggle.

Jewish Quarterly Review, Philadelphia, July: MAYER SULZBERGER, Polity of the Ancient Hebrews; H. BRODY, A Tokeḥah by Saadya Gaon; MAX L. MARGOLIS, Recent Biblical Literature; DAVID PHILIPSON, Lazarus' "Ethics of Judaism"; ISRAEL FRIEDLÄNDER, Krauss' "A Moses Legend".

Jewish Review, London and New York, July: L. P. RASTORGUEFF, Disabilities of the Jews in Russia; H. SPERLING, Jewish Sectaries, III; The Chassidim; J. A. J. DE VILLIERS, Holland and Some of Her Jews; M. BRANN, Jewry on the Eve of the XXth Century; L. GOETZ, The Ritual Murder Charge.

Journal of Biblical Literature, Boston, Vol. XXXI, Part II: ROYDEN K. YERKES, Some Notes on the Use of חֵן in Genesis; GEORGE A. BARTON, Original Home of the Story of Job; ANDREW D. HEFFERN, The Four Women in St. Matthew's Genealogy of Christ; GEORGE D. CASTOR, Relation of Mark to Source of Q; EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, Vocabulary of Luke and Acts; ERNEST D. BURTON, Some Phases of the Synoptic Problem.

Journal of Religious Psychology, Worcester, July: W. D. WALLIS, Fear in Religion; JAMES H. LEUBA, Dynamism, the Primitive Nature Philosophy; JOSIAH MORSE, Prejudice, Education and Religion; F. T. MAYER-OAKES, Reestablishment of Religious Conviction; J. H. KAPLAN, Modern Judaism.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, July: H. KELLY, Meaning of Mysticism; A. SPAGNOLO, Fragment of an Unknown Latin Version of the Apostolic Constitutions; A. SPAGNOLO and C. H. TURNER, An Early Version of the Eighty-fifth Apostolic Canon; A. SOUTER, Freiburg Fragments of a MS. of the Pelagian Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul; H. S. CRONIN, Examination of Some Omissions of the Codex Sinaiticus in St. John's Gospel; V. AMMUNDSEN, Rule of Truth in Irenæus; R. H. CONNOLLY, The Book of Life; H. STUART JONES, Recent Discoveries in the Catacombs of S. Callistus.

London Quarterly Review, London, July: J. RENDEL HARRIS, A New St. Teresa; ALFRED E. GARVIE, One World, One Gospel, and One Church; GEORGE JACKSON, Dean Church: An Appreciation; E. E. KELLETT, The Translation of the New Testament; W. H. S. AUBREY, Puritanism: its Merits and its Mistakes; DORA M. JONES, English Writers and the Making of Italy; R. NEWTON FLEW, The Apocalypse: A Study of Methods.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, July: E. BRENNECKE, Interrelation of Body and Soul; T. E. SCHMAUK, Reinhard Buchwald's Preface to Luther's Letters; E. P. H. PFATTEICHER, Our Educational Ideals at Work; CLARENCE E. KRUMBHOLZ, Hellenism and Christianity; FRITZ O. EVERS, The Law with Jesus and Paul; J. R. P. SCLATER, Duty of Mental Sympathy; J. C. MATTES, The Reconstructed Christ and the Reconstructionists, II; CHARLES R. KEITER, Immigration in the Nineteenth Century in its Relation to the Lutheran Church in the United States; JOHN D. M. BROWN, Text of the Epistle of Jude, III;

HAVELOCK ELLIS, Individualism and Socialism; THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, Parables and Their Interpretation.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, July: CASPAR R. GREGORY, Ministry of the Word; H. A. WELLER, Pioneer Lutheranism Beyond the Frontier of Early Civilization in Pennsylvania; H. H. WALKER, Carl Ferdinand Walther, D.D., the Luther of America; JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, The Scriptures and the Confession in the General Synod Constitutional Amendment; DAVID H. BAUSLIN, Primacy of Theological Studies; LEANDER S. KEYSER, Lutheran Theology and Christian Experience; M. HADWIN FISCHER, Christology of St. James; JOHN ERLER, Present Day Social Problems from a Christian Standpoint; Current Theological Thought.

Methodist Review, New York and Cincinnati, July-August: E. W. MILLER, Adolf Harnack in the Classroom; W. J. DAVIDSON, Psychology of the Pulpit; H. T. BAKER, Modern Novel in England and America; H. H. BEATTYS, "Fishermen"; GRANT SHOWERMAN, Life and Logic; W. C. RHOADES, Lancelot Andrewes, and the Minister's Prayers; H. F. WARD, Some Aspects of Recent Drama; PHILIP J. ROBERTS, Josef Israëls; L. H. BUGBEE, Moral Meaning of Italian Art; H. L. E. LUERING, Ancient Witness of Christianity from Central Asia; EDNA B. STERNER, The Ballad.

Methodist Review Quarterly, Nashville, July: W. H. P. FAUNCE, Aim of Education; W. N. TOBIE, Cosmic Principle of the Cross; EDWIN MIMS, Religious Tone of Victorian Literature; E. C. DARGAN, Frederick W. Robertson: the Man and the Preacher; H. C. SHELDON, John Henry Newman as Roman Catholic Apologist; JAMES M. DIXON, Gipsy Smith and the Gipsies; MRS. GROSS ALEXANDER, American Women Going after Heathen Gods; S. PARKES CADMAN, Professor Davison on the Holy Spirit; JOHN B. WHITFORD, Unique Literary Quality of the Old Testament Writings; THOMAS H. HADEN, Christian University for Japan; DAVID Y. THOMAS, The Church and the Poor.

Monist, Chicago, July: BERTRAND RUSSELL, Philosophy of Bergson; JAMES H. LEUBA, Psychotherapeutic Cults: Christian Science, Mind Cure, New Thought; HARTLEY B. ALEXANDER, Mystery of Life; JAMES G. TOWNSEND, Bergson and Religion; PAUL CARUS, the Anti-Intellectual Movement of To-Day; BRUNO JORDAN, Kant and Bergson; R. GARBE, Postscript on Buddhism and Christianity.

Moslem World, London, July: Editorial; Henry Martyn; A. E. GARVIE, Points of Contact; J. DAVIDSON FRAME, Bahaism in Persia; W. H. T. GAIRDNER, "The Way" of a Mohammedan Mystic; Missions in Morocco; JULIUS RICHTER, The World-Wide Mission of Christianity; FREDERICK JOHNSON, Baghdad as a Moslem Center; E. M. WHERRY, Some Unfounded Moslem Claims.

Open Court, Chicago, July: HARTLEY B. ALEXANDER, A Pawnee Mystery; PAUL CARUS, The Superpersonality of Christ; WILLIAM B. SMITH, The Humanity of Christ; STANWOOD COBB, Christian Missions in the Orient; ALBERT J. EDMUNDS, Buddhist Omissions in Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

Open Court, Chicago, August: ARTHUR MACDONALD, *Mentality of Nations in Connection with Patho-Social Conditions*; PAUL CARUS, *Life of Goethe*; HARTLEY B. ALEXANDER, *A Pawnee Mystery*; A. KAMPMEIER, *Brothers and Sisters of Jesus*.

Philosophical Review, Lancaster and New York, July: A. W. MOORE, *Bergson and Pragmatism*; FRANK THILLY, *Relation of Consciousness and Object in Sense-Perception*; GEORGE H. SABINE, *Descriptive and Normative Sciences*; W. H. SHELDON, *Consistency and Ultimate Dualism*.

Philosophical Review, Lancaster, September: OSCAR EWALD, *Philosophy in Germany in 1911*; ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, *Problem of Time in Recent French Philosophy*; GEORGE H. SABINE, *Professor Bosanquet's Logic and the Concrete Universal*; EDWARD L. SCHAUB, *Hegel's Criticism of Fichte's Subjectivism I*.

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, July: JOHN S. STAHR, *William James*; FLOYD W. TOMKINS, *The Marks of the Prophet*; A. O. REITER, *Place of the Christian Minister in Organized Society*; EDWARD S. BROMER, *Is Walt Whitman the Best Representative of America's Independent Spirit in Poetry?*; OSWIN S. FRANTZ, *Place of Paul in Early Christianity*; PAUL B. RUPP, *The Minister and the New Theology*; A. V. HESTER, *Contemporary Sociology*.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, July: JOSEPH PALMER, *Contemporaneous Origin of the Gospels*; SAMUEL Z. BATTEN, *Priesthood of all Believers*; RYLAND KNIGHT, *Ultimate Authority in Moral Truth*; H. W. PROVENCE, *Challenge of the New China*; J. C. HILDEN, *John Stuart Mill on "Nature"*; A. R. ABERNATHY, *Jesus the Prince of the World*.

Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes, Paris, Juillet: A. PUECH, *Les origines du Priscillianisme et l'orthodoxie de Priscillien (Fin)*; PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE, *Refrigerium*; PIERRE BATIFFOL, *Un prétendu hypogée gnostique du IV^e siècle*.

La Ciencia Tomista, Madrid, Julio-Agosto: LUIS G. ALONSO GETINO, *Don Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, † 19 Mayo de 1912*; MARIANO MAESTRE, *Budismo y basilidismo*; FRANCISCO MARIN-SÓLA, *La homogeneidad de la doctrina católica*; ALBERTO COLUNGA, *De ciencia de las religiones*; JOSÉ D. GAFO, *De cuestiones sociales*; E. COLUNGA, *De derecho eclesiástico*.

Lehre und Wehre, St. Louis, August: *Die Modernisten im Papstum nach ihrer eigenen Darstellung*; *Die Assyriologie und das Alte Testament*; Martin Luther.

Recherches de Science Religieuse, Paris, Juillet-Août: ALBERT CON-DAMIN, *Trois poèmes de Jérémie*; MICHEL DEBIÈVRE, *La définition du Concile de Vienne sur l'âme, 6 mai 1312*; PAUL GALTIER, *Les droits du Démon et l'obéissance du Christ*; JOSEPH DE GUIBERT, *Une source de saint Jean Damascène, de Fide orthodoxa*; LEONCE DE GRANDMAISON, *La Semaine d'ethnologie religieuse*.

Revue Bénédictine, Paris, Juillet: J. CHAPMAN, *The Diatessaron and the western text of the Gospels*; G. MORIN, I. *Une production inédite de l'école de S. Augustin*. II. *Le Meltis castellum des choré-*

vêques Pirmin et Landri, Meltburch en Brabant?; A. WILMART, I. Fragments du Ps-Origène sur le Psaume XCI dans une collection espagnole. II. Le feuillet oncial de Bescançon; U. BERLIÈRE, Les évêques Auxiliaires de Liège (suite).

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Louvain, Juillet: A. d'ALÈS, Tertullien et Calliste. Le témoignage de saint Hippolyte (suite, à suivre); PIERRE DE PUNIER, Onction et confirmation; PAUL GALTIER, Onction et confirmation; E. LESNE, La dime des biens ecclésiastiques aux IX^e et X^e siècles (à suivre).

Revue de Théologie et des Questions Religieuses, Montauban, Mai: HENRI CHAVANNES, La question biblique à propos des réunions de Morges; EUGÈNE DIÈNY, Réduction à l'essentiel des Déclarations ou Confessions de foi (suite et fin); CH. BRUSTON, De l'Institution de la Sainte-Cène.

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, Kain (Belgique), Juillet: M. S. GILLET, Les Judgments de Valeur et la Conception Théologique de la Morale; F. PALHORIÈS, La Théorie de l'Intelligence chez saint Bonaventure; L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, L'Histoire des Religions de l'Inde et l'Apologetique; J. DE GHELLINCK, La "Species quadriformis Sacramentorum" des canonistes du XII^e siècle et Hugues de Saint Victor; M. S. GILLET, Bulletin de Philosophie; A. LEMONNOYER ET B. ALLO, Bulletin de Science des Religions; M. JACQUIN, Bulletin d'Histoire des Institutions ecclésiastiques.

Theologische Studiën, Utrecht, XXX Jaargang, Aflevering IV; J. RIDDERBOS, Voorzienigheidsleer en Wereldbeschouwing bij vroegere en hedendaagsche Gereformeerden (I); H. H. MEULENBELT, Exegetica; F. E. DAUBANTON, Een Calvijn-monument (IV).

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Innsbruck, XXXVI Band, 3 Heft: JAK. MÜLLER, Der 'historische Jesus' der protestantischen freisinnigen Leben-Jesu-Forschung; TH. SCHERMANN, Die Abendmahls-liturgie der Neophyten nach ägyptischen Quellen v. 2-6 Jahrhundert; U. HOLZMEISTER, Der hl. Paulus, vor dem Richterstuhle des Festus; F. PANGERL, Studien über Albert den Grossen; P. SINTHERN, Kritiker und Kritisches zu Grisars 'Luther'.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01026 1818

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

